

## MINUTES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Monday 27<sup>th</sup> November

7:30pm – Function Room, The Harlington

**Present:** Cllr Pierce - Chairman  
Cllr Schofield  
Cllr Robinson  
Cllr Gotel  
Cllr Jasper (presentation only)  
Cllr Hope

**Also Present:** Cllr Woods  
Cllr Walton, Cllr Smith and Janet Stanton (presentation only)

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

1	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>No apologies</p>
2	<p><b>Declarations of interest to any item on the agenda</b></p> <p>17/02684/FUL The Fosse Pheasant Copse - Leslie Holt</p>
3.	<p><b>Public Session</b></p> <p>One member of the public was present.</p> <p>The following gave a presentation on The Elvetham Chase Development/Pale Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emma Gruenbaum &amp; Simon Knight - Wates Developments</li> <li>• Steve Jenkins – I transport</li> <li>• Nick Kilby – Cratus (Communications)</li> <li>• Nick Taylor – Carter Jonas (Planning Consultant)</li> </ul> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC comments in March 2017 and have since been amending plans</li> <li>• Primary school will be built on site, £5m towards it</li> <li>• Help fund expansion of Calthorpe Park School</li> <li>• Preschool on site</li> <li>• There will be a few retail units</li> <li>• 40% homes will be affordable</li> <li>• Highway improvements including 7 junctions</li> <li>• Change in access – a new road into the site will be created from a roundabout off Fleet Road which will connect with the existing Pale Lane. The rest of Pale Lane will be for pedestrians /cyclists only. HCC has agreed this.</li> <li>• Amendments to cycle route, two crossing on Fleet Road will be created with</li> </ul>

	<p>use of islands. Can't have cycle route solely on one side as there are space and tree restrictions. Members raised concerns hundreds of children crossing main road still unsafe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New community bus scheme – 10 year service from site to Elvetham Heath to Fleet station. Will run am &amp; pm and start from 05:30 unit sold (but is negotiable)</li> <li>• Can't put pathway through Great Bog Copse as would deteriorate in winter and would be unsafe as not policed</li> <li>• Traffic models have included Grove Farm development. Members made comments computer models are unrealistic</li> <li>• Financial contribution will be made towards doctor's surgeries – they offered to put one on site but were told it couldn't be operated at present. They have to make a financial contribution but could, if asked, install one in future</li> <li>• Hundreds of objection comments - top three objections were traffic, schools, healthcare</li> </ul> <p>Members thanked the team from Wates for their presentation</p>
4	<p><b>Approval of the Minutes</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on the 13<sup>th</sup> November were accepted as a correct record of the meeting.</p>
5	<p>Comments due before meeting:</p> <p>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. (Transport Assessment Addendum received 6th November 2017)  Comments required by 27th November</p> <p><b>PREVIOUS COMMENTS STAND</b></p> <p>Although lacking amenities, the housing development is well designed, it is just in the wrong location - The development will have a negative impact on the surrounding area and put further strain on the already stressed infrastructure.</p> <p><b>OBJECTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suds system needs a long term maintenance plan as it will decline in efficiency after a few years</li> <li>• Developer is redefining the Western boundary of Fleet as the River Hart and its immediate flood plain.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• It is too far from the main facilities of Fleet to be deemed an extension, most facilities are not walkable.</li> <li>• The sole access into Fleet to the station is over the railway and the restrained junction of Fleet Road, Elvetham Road, Reading Road North</li> </ul>

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.
- 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 much-celebrated bus service is not that regular and is criticised for not linking up with the mainline train services.
  
- 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 in particular 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 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 becomes 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!

NOTE the words about parking, not resolved, but policy requirements will be met – there is no POLICY only an advisory standard.

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. DON'T DEVELOP ISOLATED SITES.

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 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.

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.

<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

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 support an economy fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.”

And further at NPPF para 21 it states “local planning authorities should:

- *Set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth.”*

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.

Local traffic jams stifle economic development and create local pollution, both contrary to sustainable development.

Para 37 NPPF states:

*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.*

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.

Under the current Local Plan, the development fails:

- GEN1 (ii) causes loss of amenity to existing and adjoining residential, commercial, recreational by virtue of increased pollution and traffic generation.
- GEN1 (iv) development constitutes ribbon and sporadic development unrelated to existing patterns of development within the district – this is

- not an urban extension.
- 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.
- GEN1 (x) will lead to problems further afield by causing heavy traffic to pass through residential areas.
- 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.
- T9 does not improve the Fleet Road /Fleet Station/ Waterfront Business Park with regard to road safety as a consequence of development.

17/02587/FUL

14 Wickham Place

Provide wheelchair access directly into ground floor flat, by installing a new doorway, leading from a non-used bin storage area, directly into clients flat  
Comments required by 11th December

NO OBJECTION

17/02357/FUL

141-145 , Clarence Road Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing former red cross building and garage and erection of a new building housing 8 self-contained flats with associated parking, cycles and bins.  
(Revised car parking/bin store plan received 09.11.2017)  
Comments required by 25th November

Previous comments stand

OBJECTION

' Parking is inadequate under Hart's standards

' Out of keeping with street scene

' Concern about privacy ' public view from the pavement

' Bin storage is impractical and unsightly ' an impression of a view of the site from the pavement should be submitted

17/02565/HOU

45 Highland Drive

Single storey rear and side extension to provide additional living accommodation  
Comments required by 1st December

NO OBJECTION

Subject to confirmation of number of bedrooms and a dimensioned parking plan that meets HDC standards being submitted

17/02576/FUL

Victoria House 18-22 Albert Street

Alterations to facades of building including replacement of windows and doors; together with installation of new entrance doors at ground floor, 2no. new window openings in south west elevation, 2no. new window openings in north east elevation and velux rooflights; and erection of refuse and cycle stores to

rear  
Comments required by 5th December

**OBJECTION**

- Windows on side overlook neighbours

Previous comments still stand on the assumption that 12 flats will be developed (no internal layout has been submitted with the application)

- Parking inadequate
- The building is outside the 800m walk to the station therefore adequate parking should be provided. 11 proposed spaces is not enough to meet HDC standards
- With the correct parking with the other 2 floors it will require 15 car parking spaces and 5 visitor spaces
- Parking on Albert Street will increase congestion currently being experienced and walking to the nearest public parking is unrealistic for residents.
- Unallocated parking as suggested will only exacerbate the problems.

17/02626/HOU

23 Wood Lane

Two storey side and front extension, single storey rear extension and change of roof tiles to slates

Comments required by 1st December

**OBJECTION**

- Infringement of 45 degree rule

17/02641/HOU

15 Shetland Way

Double storey side and single storey rear extension.

Comments required by 5th December

**OBJECTION**

- Parking in inadequate – a plan that meets HDC standards is needed
- Bin store needed at front of property – bins store should also be screened so it doesn't have negative effect on street scene
- Possible breach on 45 degree rule

17/02659/HOU

3 Fitzroy Road

Demolition of existing garage building and replacement with two storey integral garage building.

Comments required by 6th December

**OBJECTION**

- Garage building could be used as annex or second dwelling
- Existing dormer on main house obstructed by proposed garage roof
- Poor design – compromises original design of property

17/02711/HOU

19 Colbred Corner  
Single storey rear extension  
Comments required by 11th December

**OBJECTION**

Loss of amenity (light) to neighbour (No. 20) on north side of development due to 45 degree rule

17/02708/FUL

Rushgrove And Little Mead Reading Road North  
Detached Bungalow and accessway (resubmission)  
Comments required by 13th December

Previous comments

**OBJECTION**

- ' Back garden tandem development not acceptable
- ' Does not protect or enhance North Fleet Conservation Area
- ' Refuse collection is not practical

However the planning inspector only rejected the appeal for this application on the grounds of no SANG agreement.

17/02655/FUL

Poundworld Plus 187 - 191 Fleet Road  
189 Fleet Road - Insert 21 windows at first floor level to the existing commercial building and create a new entrance door at ground floor level to the frontage to serve a new fire escape.

Comments required by 13th December

**NO OBJECTION**

17/02684/FUL

The Fosse Pheasant Copse

Erection of a new dwelling and garage on land to the east of the existing dwelling at The Fosse. Demolition of existing flat roof garage and erection of a single new garage to serve the host dwelling

Comments required by 13th December

**OBJECTION**

- Breach of URB 18, less than designated plot size
- Development does not conserve or enhance North Fleet Conservation Area
- Trees have already been removed. Serious concern that further trees will be removed to make the site more open and the property more habitable

17/02573/HOU

Ragged Woods , Reading Road North  
Detached Double Garage in Brick with a Pan tile roof  
Comments required by 6th December

**NO OBJECTION**

But support tree officer's comments

17/02732/HOU  
 45 Albany Road  
 First floor and single storey rear extensions and new detached single garage to front following part demolition of existing rear extension  
 Comments required by 13th December

**OBJECTION**

- Poor design proposed proportions of the development are out of keeping with street scene
- Loss of a bungalow
- Ridge height increased– too tall

17/02716/HOU  
 1 Jersey Close  
 Single storey rear extension  
 Comments required by 14th December

**NO OBJECTION**  
 Subject to a parking plan that meets HDC standards (due to loss of garage)  
 Possible breach of 45 degree rule

17/02738/PRIOR  
 125 - 147 Fleet Road  
 Prior Notification requirement under Part O of the GDPO for the change of use of offices (Class B1a). To form 30 no residential apartments.  
 Comments required by 7th December

**OBJECTION**

- Another office conversion into small one and two bedroom flats
- Shared waste facilities and cycle storage clearly indicate this is a single development of 30 residential units and should therefore provide 12 affordable homes.

**Planning Appeals:**

16/03347/FUL  
 Rushgrove And Little Mead Reading Road North  
 Detached Bungalow and accessway (resubmission)  
 Appeal Dismissed, Costs Partially Allowed

**Enforcement cases received:**

None received

**Enforcement cases closed:**

17/00107/COU3  
 Vinehurst St James Road  
 Complaint Alleged unauthorised change of use of single dwelling house to two

	<p>independent dwellings  Conclusion NFA at this time Site to be Monitored</p> <p>17/00251/COND2  154 Connaught Road Complaint  Alleged commencement of development without compliance with conditions 3 and 5 of planning permission 17/01016/FUL  Conclusion Planning Application Approved</p>
7	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p><b>Hart Planning Meeting Dates</b>  13th December</p>
8	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>11<sup>th</sup> December – 7pm in the RVS, Harlington</p>

**The meeting closed at 9.35pm**

**Signed:**.....

**Date:** .....