



ADDENDUM

Place Service Planning Committee Addendum



Introducing the Committee

Below is a list of the 11 Members of the Planning Committee in alphabetical order:

Councillor Simon Ambler
Councillor Brian Blewett
Councillor Graham Cockarill
Councillor Angela Delaney
Councillor John Kennett
Councillor Alan Oliver (Chairman)
Councillor Richard Quarterman
Councillor James Radley
Councillor Tim Southern
Councillor Sharyn Wheale
Councillor Jane Worlock

FIRE EVACUATION OFFICERS:

Lead Officer: Daryl Phillips

Deputy Lead Officer: Peter Lee (responsible for ensuring evacuations procedures are read out by the Chairman, bringing evacuation procedures and other equipment. - checking the 2nd floor only to include toilets, Members' Room, Chairman's Room)

Public Officer: Peter Lee (responsible for guiding and evacuating members of the public)

Member Officer: Daryl Phillips (responsible for guiding and evacuating members of the Committee)

If you have any more comments about the Planning Committee process, please telephone the Committee Officer, Sabrina Cranny on (01252) 774141.

URGENT ITEM

There have been several instances of works and operations taking place outside of approved working hours at the site known as Hawley Park Farm in connection with planning permission 18/00334/FUL which was allowed at appeal.

Officers are seeking Members' endorsement of the enforcement actions taken by Officers to draft and serve a Temporary Stop Notice together with a Breach of Condition Notice on the site. This will strengthen the Council's ability to take further enforcement action and to consider options such as prosecution and/or injunction should any further breaches take place.

Item No:	6	Reference No:	21/02051/FUL
Retention of a replacement dwelling (retrospective).			
At			
28 Finns Business Park, Bowenhurst Lane. Crondall, GU10 5HP			

OFFICER PRESENTING: Mr Miguel Martinez

UPDATE

Page 17 of the agenda reports pack advised Members that the public consultation exercise expired on 08.10.2021, which is four days after the publication of the Committee agenda. It also states that an update would be provided within the Addendum relating to any representation(s) that may be received during that period.

Members are advised that no public representations have been received after the publication of the Committee report and this retrospective planning application has not attracted any public objection.

Correction

The recommendation of this item shown in pages 11 and 34 of the agenda should be amended to read as follows:

Page 11 amendment:

RECOMMENDATION A. To take the application to Full Council as a departure with a recommendation to GRANT permission subject to conditions(listed below);

RECOMMENDATION B. To REFUSE planning permission for appropriate reasons (listed below).

Page 34 amendment:

“RECOMMENDATION A:

If members are minded to approve this application, that Planning Committee refers it to Full Council as a departure with a recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to the following planning conditions:” (reasons as listed in the Committee Report).

“RECOMMENDATION B:

If members are minded to refuse this application, that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the following reasons:” (reasons as listed in the Committee Report).

Speaker Details

No registered speakers.

Item No:	7	Reference No:	20/03140/HOU
Erection of a two storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey extension, insertion of a set of double doors to ground floor rear and a window to ground floor side and internal alterations			
At			
Laundry Farm House, Wedmans Lane, Rotherwick, Hook, Hampshire, RG27 9BX			

OFFICER PRESENTING: Mrs Stephanie Baker

UPDATE

The applicant has submitted an additional statement from Mr Edwards, of Forum Heritage Services, commenting on the detail of the consultation response from the Council's Conservation Officer in respect of both the householder planning application and Listed Building Consent application.

This statement dated 7th October 2021 outlines that the current rear extension should be treated as part of the Listed Building itself, not as a curtilage listed building. The statement outlines that the applicant considers the extension would be subservient and ancillary building due to its size and materials. It is contested that the setting of the listed building would not be impacted. The statement also sets out that the proposal would increase the thermal performance of the building and insulation would be a public benefit.

The statement also sets out that if a historic ceiling is found (lath and plaster) it could be repaired or replaced like-for-like via condition, that details regarding the works in the boot room and wet services for a bathroom at first floor could also be conditioned. It outlines that the proposed roof works are proactive before issues arise. It states that the use of salvaged tiles or reclaimed or new tiles could be secured via condition.

In addition, the applicant highlighted comments from Mr Edwards which pre-date the submissions (dated December 2020) and a 'second opinion' from Dr Carole Fry of AHC Consultants also dated December 2020.

Officer response

Officers note the difference in professional opinion between Hart District Council and external heritage specialists in relation to whether the existing rear link extension forms a curtilage-listed building due to the presence of the link or whether it forms part of the listed building itself. In either respect, its demolition and replacement would lead to substantial harm due to a total loss of historic fabric in this area and this detail is immaterial to the conclusions set out within the Officer recommendation report to Committee.

Officers would also take this opportunity to reiterate the statutory requirement from Section 66(1) of the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

In practice, a finding of harm to a listed building is a consideration to which the decision-maker must give “considerable importance and weight” when carrying out the balancing exercise as confirmed in planning case law.

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF 2021 requires “great weight” to be given to the asset's conservation and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Paragraph 200 of the NPPF 2021 requires any level of harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset to be outweighed by clear and convincing justification.

Correction

Page 47 of the agenda reports pack includes a paragraph towards the bottom of the page starting with “A householder planning application (20/03140/HOU)”. This paragraph should be replaced with the following wording:

“A concurrent Listed Building Consent application (20/03141/LBC) has been submitted alongside this householder application which specifically considers the works to listed building which fall outside the scope of planning permission sought. This includes the internal works to the building and incorporates any works which do not amount to the definition of ‘development’ as set out within section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.”

Speaker Details

*Speaking for the Parish Council: Mr J Wort, Rotherwick Parish Council

*Speaking For the Application: Mr A Partridge, Southern Planning

Item No:	8	Reference No:	20/03141/LBC
Erection of a two storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey extension, insertion of a set of double doors to ground floor rear and a window to ground floor side and internal alterations			
At			
Laundry Farm House, Wedmans Lane, Rotherwick, Hook, Hampshire, RG27 9BX			

OFFICER PRESENTING: Mrs Stephanie Baker
UPDATE

See Item No 7 above.

Speaker Details

*Speaking For the Application: Mr A Partridge, Southern Planning

Item No:	9	Reference No:	21/00608/FUL
Erection of a 72 bedroom care home (Use Class C2) with associated access, parking, landscaping and site infrastructure			
At			
Land east of Reading Road, Hook, Hampshire			

OFFICER PRESENTING: Mr Peter Lee

UPDATE

A letter from the applicant, Care UK, has been sent to Members regarding the Officer's report. In summary, the letter highlights the following issues:

- The officer's report does confirm that there is an unmet need for residential / nursing care bedspaces in the district during the current Local Plan period; this need ought to be met as soon as possible, not delayed unnecessarily.
- The proposed site is outside the settlement boundary but it is immediately adjacent to that boundary; a location appropriate for a care home, where residents are not physically able to leave the home without assistance, but visitors and staff can easily access the home as well as services in Hook.
- The officer's report identifies a site within the settlement boundary as a possible alternative; however, at 1.86ha, that site is more than twice the size of the application site (0.78ha) – much too big for this care home proposal alone – and a scheme consisting of a larger number of beds would not be economically viable. This site is being marketed at residential developers and is clearly suitable for a residential scheme; this has been confirmed by the Council's planning department via a pre-application enquiry.
- The site is not in any way isolated from built development; 85 new homes have just been completed immediately to the south of the application site, and there is a garden centre and small number of residential properties immediately to the north. The care home would be an entirely appropriate addition to the immediate local context.

Officer response:

It is correct that there is currently considered to be an unmet need for residential / nursing care bedspaces in the District but it must be highlighted that this is throughout the current Local Plan period up until 2032. As noted by the Planning Policy team there is no need to frontload the provision of care accommodation and there would be no benefit from allowing an over-provision in the early part of the plan period.

The details submitted with the application state that residents of the proposed care home will have a: "...range of care needs, from residential care to full nursing care. Some residents will have dementia and others will have conditions such as multiple sclerosis or motor neuron disease." It is not therefore considered that all residents will be immobile or unable to leave the care home without assistance as suggested by the application. No planning controls could be imposed to ensure this would be the case. As such, it is considered that there is potential for residents of the

development to choose to visit the town or to be taken out for recreation by relatives etc.

The alternative site identified should not be automatically discounted purely on its size without any investigation as to the whether the site could be split, or a mixed-use scheme could be carried out.

The settlement boundary has been agreed through the Local Plan process and was extended to incorporate the area of the housing development approved to the south of the application site. That scheme was designed to have a soft landscaped edge to the countryside in order to clearly mark the transition from the settlement into the open countryside. The garden centre to the north is an appropriate countryside use and the scattered residential developments are historic.

Speaker Details

*Speaking For the Parish Council: Mr F Kirkham, Hook Parish Council

*Speaking Against the Application: Ms C Randall

*Speaking For the Application: Mr A Ryley, DLBP Ltd.

Item No:	10	Reference No:	21/01048/OUT
Hybrid application for a) Outline development (with matters except access reserved) for a retirement care living development comprising up to 160 units (C2 use) and local community facilities, pedestrian and vehicular access, parking areas and landscaping and b) change of use of agricultural land to Suitable Alternative Green Space (SANG) with sustainable drainage pond			
At			
Owens Farm, Newnham Road, Hook, Hampshire, RG27 9NG			

OFFICER PRESENTING: Mr Miguel Martinez

UPDATE

Correction

Page 134 of the Agenda Reports Pack lists relevant policies of the Hart Local Plan. Policy H2 (Affordable Housing) was omitted however it is a relevant policy in the assessment of the proposed development. Section 10 of the report (page 150) makes reference to this policy in the text.

Speaker Details

*Speaking For the Parish Council: Mr F Kirkham, Hook Parish Council

*Speaking Against the Application: Ms S Mesher