

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Date and Time:** Thursday, 24 August 2017 at 7 pm

**Place:** Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

### **COUNCILLORS**

Cockarill (Chairman)

Ambler, Axam (substitute Radley (James)), Billings, Blewett, Crampton (substitute Southern), Forster, Morris, Oliver, Parker (substitute Gorys), Southern, Wheale

### **Officers:**

Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
Nick Steevens	Head of Regulatory Services
Emma Whittaker	Planning Manager
Adrian Ellis	Principal Planner - East Hampshire District Council
Wendi Batteson	Shared Legal Services
Alison Cottrell	Committee Services

## **24 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 August 2017 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

## **25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies had been received from Councillors Gorys, substituted by Councillor Parker, Councillor Radley (James), substituted by Councillor Axam and Councillor Southern (substituted by Councillor Crampton).

## **26 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

## **27 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Parker indicated that he was a subscribing member of the Fleet Pond Society and the Fleet Pond Society Executive, but that this was not a prejudicial interest.

Councillors Wheale and Forster indicated that they were subscribing members of the Fleet Pond Society but that this was not a prejudicial interest.

Councillors Oliver and Forster advised that they were members of Fleet Parish Council but that this was not a prejudicial interest.

Councillor Forster advised that he was a member of Hampshire County Council but that this was not a prejudicial interest.

**28 17/00471/OUT – HARTLAND PARK, BRAMSHOT LANE, FLEET**

Outline planning application with means of access to be determined (all other matters reserved for subsequent approval), for the demolition of existing buildings and structures and site clearance, the construction of up to 1,500 dwellings (Use Class C3), a local centre including retail, commercial, community premises and a primary school (Use Classes A1 to A5, B1, D1 and D2), bin stores, car and cycle parking, open space, landscaping and ecological habitats and suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG), site remediation, earthworks and ground modelling, drainage works including ponds for surface water attenuation, relocation of existing electricity sub-station, provision of utilities infrastructure, and all other ancillary and enabling works

Full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and structures and site clearance, the construction of 181 dwellings (Use Class C3) and roads, including connection to existing roundabout at Ively Road, bin stores, car and cycle parking, open space, landscaping and ecological habitats, and all other ancillary and enabling works.

The Joint Chief Executive explained the nature of the recommendation to Planning Committee. It was not a final recommendation to grant permission at this stage as there were outstanding matters that required a further referral back to Planning Committee. There was however sufficient information for Members to consider with certainty physical matters associated with the quantum and scale of development on the site without prejudice to the future consideration of outstanding issues. There were therefore two recommendations. The first was that Planning Committee agrees the principle of development and the scale, mass and quantum of development (i.e. up to 1,500 new homes) on the site and refers the details of Phase 1 to Major Sites Sub-Committee for detailed consideration. The second recommendation was that subject to:

- (i) Hampshire County Council withdrawing its holding highway objection;
- (ii) Confirmation of the outcome of viability issues associated with the testing of affordable new home provision; and
- (iii) The securing of appropriate SANG provision

the application be brought back to Planning Committee for final decision on the above, completion of a planning obligation AND any other matters that may arise (including the outcome of the Major Sites Sub-Committee meeting) that have not been previously addressed.

The Planning Manager explained a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) was in place. It had been used to fund the services of an experienced Principle Planning Officer to help the Council process and assess the planning application, and to commission independent evaluation of development viability and site contamination. They are used right across the country and are specifically encouraged by the Government to ensure that local authorities have the right resources/skills to determine planning applications. The Government and the LGA has issued comprehensive guidance and support about the value of their use. They are open and transparent and are designed to be used as a project management tool which the local planning authorities and applicants can use to agree timescales, actions and resources for handling particular applications. They do not commit the local planning authority to a particular outcome. Notwithstanding a PPA the Council was free to determine the

application in any way it chooses. The presence of a PPA was not a material consideration in the determination of a planning application or appeal - it has no relevance to a planning decision. Examples of the use of PPAs were also given.

Members discussed the following:

- That the site was a substantial brownfield site situated in a defined Local Plan Strategic Gap.
- The scale of the proposed development had to be balanced against the sites past industrial use and the scale of warehouse and distribution development granted in 2009.
- That any approval of the application would have to be referred to full Council as it would be a departure from Saved Local Plan Policy DEV12.
- The loss of DEV12 would be a loss of employment land but that recent evidence confirmed that there was no need to retain the land for employment purposes.
- Development would have an impact upon the openness of the Strategic Gap at this point but with good mitigation the impact could be made acceptable.
- The impact of the existing 2009 permission was compared with the impact demonstrated in the new applications masterplan.
- Sky glow and light spill and how this could be counteracted.
- Structural landscaping around the boundaries of the site was important.
- Whether a woodland boundary treatment to provide screening together with a robust landscape strategy could be secured as part of the conditions moving forward.
- Measure to enhance or reinforce boundary treatment at key points were discussed albeit development on the site would never be hidden from view.
- In principle density of development was not seen as an important issue – but good design was. In this regard the illustrative material submitted with the application and the full details submitted with Phase I demonstrated good design.
- Recognising that the development would comprise a mixture of two, three, four and some five storey buildings the scale and mass of development on the site was seen as acceptable.
- The key was to ensure that proper controls were put in place to ensure that the developer did not deviate away from what was considered acceptable – a constraints plan was required.
- Tree preservation orders on trees and how these would be treated.
- That the developer would make enquiries to ascertain whether or not the spine road would accommodate a bus service and that this point would be clarified.
- Impact upon Fleet Pond.
- Whether the proposed SANG would act as an alternative attractor to ease direct pressure on Fleet Pond.
- The levels of commuters and whether or not they would try and use Fleet Pond as a short cut to Fleet Station.
- Ways in which Fleet Pond could be protected.
- That there are currently secure heavy duty fences around the boundary of Fleet Pond closest to the site which would prevent people using Fleet Pond as a short cut to Fleet Station.
- That discussions are taking place in relation to Section 106 developer contributions and how some of this could be used to mitigate damage and cope with increased footfall.
- Whether or not allotments would be provided on the site of whether provision could be made elsewhere.

- That whilst healthcare provision on site would be the ideal, agreement has been reached with the CCG to replace the current Southwood Surgery with a larger Southwood Surgery that would be able to accommodate the raise in numbers.
- The provision of a new primary school on site at 2-form entry with scope to expand the school to 2.5-form entry in the future.
- The time and distance that children may have to walk to get to school.
- That Hampshire County Council were considering walking routes and transport provision for children attending secondary school and that this would come back before the Committee.
- In referral to Major Sites sub-Committee the six key issues had been raised:
  - ❖ Boundary treatments to the site which was key to Phase I.
  - ❖ Lighting in Phase I.
  - ❖ The design of the properties that must be to an extremely high standard.
  - ❖ Gardens and allotments.
  - ❖ Permitted development rights.
  - ❖ Parking arrangements and cycle parking.

Other matters for future consternation when the application was back to Planning Committee.

- At present, only 20% affordable homes are proposed due to rising costs, but that consultants are testing that viability and would be considered at a future Planning Committee.
- Where the full complement of sustainable housing was not being achieved, whether review mechanisms could be put in place that would allow more affordable housing to come through in later phases.
- That strategic highway implications are still being discussed by Hampshire County Council highways and the developer.
- The access route along Bramshot Lane which currently forms the access route to and from Cody Technology Park (but recognised that the issue was not relevant to the consideration of the current application).
- Whether negotiations could take place with the MOD to secure a cycle route and easy access to Fleet Station.
- Public transport and whether Stagecoach could provide a service through the proposed development.
- That if Stagecoach would not provide a bus service, whether the developer would consider a package that would provide a community bus in order to make the site more sustainable.

## **DECISION**

- A Planning Committee agrees the principle of development and the scale, mass and quantum of development (i.e. up to 1,500 new homes) on the site and refers the details of Phase I to Major Sites Sub-Committee for detailed consideration.
- B Subject to:
- i. Hampshire County Council withdrawing its holding highway objection;
  - ii. Confirmation of the outcome of viability issues associated with the testing of affordable new home provision; and
  - iii. The securing of appropriate SANG provision

the application is brought back to Planning Committee for final decision on the above, completion of a planning obligation **AND** any other matters that may arise (including the outcome of the Major Sites Sub-Committee meeting) that have not been previously addressed.

**Notes:**

Speaking for Fleet Town Council – Councillor Bob Schofield.

Speaking against the application – Mr Phill Gower – Fleet and Church Crookham Society and Mr Colin Gray – Chairman - Fleet Pond Society.

Speaking for the application – Mr Mark Sitch - St Edward Homes Limited

A site visit took place on the 23 August 2017 attended by Councillors Axam, Ambler, Forster, Oliver, Parker and Wheale.

During consideration of this item, the meeting adjourned for a comfort break at 9.05 pm and reconvened at 9.15 pm.

The meeting closed at 10.10 pm.