

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Wednesday, 11 November 2020 at 7pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Ambler, Blewett, Cockarill, Davies (substitute for Delaney), Kennett, Quarterman (Chairman), Radley, Southern, Worlock

Officers:

Emma Whittaker: Planning Manager
Robert Moorhouse: Principal Planning Officer
Celia Wood: Committee Services Officer

26 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies received from Councillor Delaney substituted by Councillor Davies.

28 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Chairman announcements.

29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

30 LOCAL VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS LIST

A request was made that the Planning Committee agree the adoption of the local list of validation requirements for planning applications.

Members noted:

- Local Planning Authorities (LPA) are required to publish information listing what is required to accompany planning applications for validation.
- There is a requirement to review the Local List every two years and it was last reviewed by the Planning Committee in March 2018. As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic the process of consultation on the review has been delayed for 2020.
- Hart officers have reviewed both the content of the list and the format to simplify the checklists.

DECISION

Planning Committee agreed the adoption of the Local Validation List as set out in Appendix A to come into effect on 16th November 2020.

31 19/02659/FUL – POLICE STATION, 13 CROOKHAM ROAD, FLEET NON-DETERMINATION PLANNING APPEAL

To inform the Planning Committee of the submission of the non-determination planning appeal and to establish what the decision of the Planning Committee would have been had it determined the application.

Members considered:

The information and the three reasons that would have formed the recommended reasons for refusal had the application not be subject to a non-determination appeal as detailed on the Addendum 1.

Members noted:

- The site does need to be developed but in a way that supports the local community in line with the Hart development plan.
- The level of parking proposed was a concern to Officers as well as the Committee. However Officers had sought an independent review to review the level of parking proposed to the site (to include mobility scooters). The conclusion to that review was that subject to matters being conditioned including a car parking management plan, that the levels of parking proposed were acceptable for this type of development. Members were also advised of a similar development in Hartley Wintney where there were similar levels of car parking provided and the car park was often underused.
- Members were advised of the Council's Public Sector Duty under the Equalities Act 2010 as set out in the Addendum as "Age" is a protected Characteristic.

Decision

The Committee confirmed it would have **refused** planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would not provide an adequate level of affordable housing. As such, the proposal is contrary Policy H2 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032 and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development would not achieve a high-quality design or positively contribute to the overall appearance of the area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, Saved Policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, Policy 10 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The site is located within 5km of the Heath Brow and Bourley and Long Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest which forms part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. In the absence of any evidence that the test of no alternatives under Regulation 62 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 can be satisfied, or evidence that there are grounds of overriding public interest, the proposed development, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, would be likely to have a significant adverse effect on the Special Protection Area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan, Policies NBE3 and NBE4 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032 and Policy 17 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan.

Meeting closed at: 7.42pm

DRAFT