



Planning Committee Addendum 14 December 2022

Introducing the Committee

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

Councillor Brian Blewett	Councillor Richard Quarterman (Chairman)
Councillor Graham Cockarill	Councillor James Radley
Councillor Steve Forster	Councillor Tim Southern
Councillor John Kennett	Councillor Peter Wildsmith
Councillor Makepeace-Browne	Councillor Jane Worlock
Councillor Alan Oliver	

FIRE EVACUATION OFFICERS:

Lead Officer: Mark Jaggard.

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: Mark Jaggard (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, Jenny Murton on (01252) 774141.

ADDENDUM FOR
THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF
14 December 2022

Item No:	7	Reference No:	21/02877/FUL
Change of use of public house to form 2 x two-bedroom dwellings with associated internal and external alterations (following part demolition of external toilet block).			
At			
The Bell PH, The Bury, Odiham, Hook, RG29 1LY			

Update

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:

Additional correspondence has been received (Planning Committee Members copied into them) concerning The Bell PH applications from Ms Helen Tyler (Director of Odiham Community Interest Company) and The Odiham Society. The summary of the different information provided by both interested parties is summarised below.

Correspondence from Councillor Helen Tyler – Director of Odiham Community Interest Company

Ms Tyler included 6 documents which she would refer to in her speech. These are summarised below.

1. Strategy to Save The Bell (dated Dec 2022) – this provides a background of The Bell and the local community, lists intentions to run it as a social venue for the community, sets out a minimum scope of works and anticipated ranges of repair costs and renovation. It also provides a narrative of community engagement and locals interests in the project, makes reference to the benefits of the project and provides a vision of how the pub would be ran by the community. It also sets out conclusions, property valuations, land registry records and applicant's purchasing offers requests and provides a plan to raise capital. The document also makes reference to rural economy paragraphs of the NPPF and vision of the HLP32, and how the saving of the Bell would comply with them.
2. Email from HCC Councillor Glen objecting to The Bell applications and showing support for the running of a pub by the local community in Odiham.
3. Community Pubs Report (2022): Resource providing quantitative/qualitative data gathered on Community Pubs to inform interested organisations on Community-Owned Pubs (COPs) about future-proof services and investment decisions.
4. Emails from 2 members from the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA). One is providing national figures about COPs and showing support for a successful

purchasing of The Bell. The other is a letter of support referring to The Bell as a pub where lower cost drinks were found away from the High Street which differed from other modern establishments in Odiham.

5. 2019 Appeal Decision (ref: APP/C17 60/W/19/3221040) concerning the residential conversion of a public house (The Plough Inn) in the village/civil parish of Longparish, Andover. Longparish Village is formed of 4 Hamlets, the Plough Inn is in one of them (Middleton). Long Parish population 716 people. Extracts from Appeal Decision below.

'The village is well served by local facilities...a church, a school [primary], village hall, shop/post office as well as another public house...in the absence of a clear village centre, these facilities are scattered across the four hamlets... some are at a considerable distance from each other.

...Premises designated as an ACV...

...Freehold advertised from November 2016 until February 2017, property marketed for a period in excess of the 6 month required.. the freehold.. was only advertised for short period of time and over the festive period...this could explain the limited level of interest...

...The submitted evidence does not adequately show that it is no longer or cannot be made commercially viable.. nor have I seen the property has been marketed for alternative uses as referred to by supporting text to policy. Neither have I seen contacts with community organisations who could be interested in using the premises other than the Parish Council.

..Local residents have established a Longparish Community Pub Ltd to acquire the site.. have commissioned a Business Buyer and Market Valuation Appraisal and prepared a Business Plan...

... My attention has been drawn to a number of...redevelopment of public houses which have been approved by the Council in recent years. However, there are inevitably differences between these various schemes, to which I ascribed limited weight. In any event I am required to determine the appeal before me, having regard to its own planning circumstances...(officers' emphasis)

... It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated the use of the premises as a public house are no longer or cannot be made commercially viable. Neither can it be concluded that the building is no longer able to provide suitable accommodation or needed for its existing use or another community use...

...The property deserves consideration as a non-designated heritage asset...the public house makes an important contribution to the vibrancy of the village. It has clearly establish itself over the past 150 or 200 years as a public house.. the loss of an important community facility would be detrimental t the historic fabric of Longparish...

...I am unable to conclude, having regard to the available evidence that this is the only viable use} [residential] for the appeal premises and therefore its optimum viable use...

Planning Officers' Response:

HT has stated there are parallels between the above appeal and the case before members, however they have not been specified. Officers' comments in this respect are below.

Longparish (population of 716) only benefits from two public houses for the four hamlets.

The size of this settlement is not comparable to Odiham, which as stated by HT is comprised of 5600 people. The range of goods, services and community facilities offered by Odiham are significantly higher.

The application site has been advertised on the market since at least August 2021 up to this date. Both the Parish Council and the Odiham Society have confirmed no interest in bidding for the premises. The marketing has not only included approaching these local groups but advertisement on the internet and local social groups, with no purchasing offers being made up to now.

The evidence supporting the current application demonstrates that a public house on the premises is no longer, and cannot be made commercially viable, considering the spatial restrictions of the building and its heritage designation.

The applicants have discharged their legislative responsibilities to offer the local community the opportunity to bid for the premises and have offered additional time for them to do so with no bidding or land transaction been achieved.

The only parallel between the two cases would appear to be the fact that there would be a heritage impact, (acknowledged by the planning assessment of the subject applications) which differs between the two cases. Also, the interest of the local community to preserve the public house use (with no formal offer to purchase the premises being made up to now).

In any event the Planning Inspector himself, in the above appeal, clearly states that each case should be considered on its own planning merits.

Correspondence from The Odiham Society (OS)

The OS letter states that officers were unable to assess and or compare benefits/harm between the development proposal and the retention of the building as a public house but run by the local community as part of the planning assessment and contains harm /benefits comparison tables comparing the two.

Planning Officers' Response:

Whilst the interest expressed by HT to run the pub by the local community has been made known to officers, the fact is there has been no offer made to acquire the premises because the financial capital required to buy/invest in the premises is still in the form of pledges, intentions and grants applied for but undecided. Furthermore, acquiring the premises is also based on the intention of doing so for a below the market value originally paid by the applicant. As such the community-run pub appears, currently, to still attract a significant level of uncertainty.

The planning assessment undertaken as part of the current applications considered the supporting information against the requirements and tests of the relevant adopted planning policies of the HLP32. The supporting information justifies the development proposed as per the planning policy requirements.

In terms of the benefits/harm comparison tables contained in the OS letter, the use of the premises as a public house (whether privately-run or community-run as stated) would likely attract less/no impacts to the significance of the heritage asset (if restoration works are undertaken only with no alterations to the building), regardless of the scoring used by the OS.

However, it is worth pointing out that a privately-run pub has been demonstrated to be economically/ commercially unviable by the applicant and as stated above there remains a significant level of uncertainty for a community-run pub to materialise and guarantee the restoration required for the designated heritage asset, its long-term conservation and long-term viable operation as a public house.

As such, the comparisons made between a viable residential use and an uncertain community pub operation does not change the likely scenario that the development proposal under consideration would likely lead to the necessary/suitable investment to the restoration and maintenance of the heritage asset. I would also secure their long-term conservation, despite of the limited level of harm identified in the planning assessment, which is outweighed by the planning and heritage benefits identified.

Speaker Details

*Odiham Parish Council; Cllr Angela McFarlane

*Speaking Against the Application; Ms Helen Tyler

*Speaking For the Application; Mr Richard Murray

Item No:	8	Reference No:	21/02878/LBC
Change of use of public house to form 2 x two-bedroom dwellings with associated internal and external alterations (following part demolition of external toilet block).			
At			
The Bell PH, The Bury, Odiham, Hook, RG29 1LY			

Update:

As Item 7.

Speaker Details

*Odiham Parish Council; Cllr Angela McFarlane

*Speaking Against the Application; Ms Helen Tyler

*Speaking For the Application; Mr Richard Murray

Item No:	9	Reference No:	22/00234/FUL
Change of use of outbuilding into a two-bedroom dwelling with associated internal/external alterations and first floor external balcony (following demolition of external deck/stairs and single storey extension).			
At			
The Bell PH, The Bury, Odiham, Hook, RG29 1LY			

Update

As Item 7 above.

Speaker Details

*Odiham Parish Council; Cllr Angela McFarlane

*Speaking Against the Application; Ms Helen Fleming

*Speaking For the Application; Mr Richard Murray

Item No:	10	Reference No:	22/00229/LBC
Change of use of outbuilding into a two-bedroom dwelling with associated internal/external alterations and first floor external balcony (following demolition of external deck/stairs and single storey extension).			
At			
The Bell PH, The Bury, Odiham, Hook, RG29 1LY			

Update:

As Item 9.

Speaker Details

*Odiham Parish Council; Cllr Angela McFarlane

*Speaking Against the Application; Ms Helen Fleming

*Speaking For the Application; Mr Richard Murray

Item No:	11	Reference No:	22/02181/LDC
Change of use of land for the siting of four mobile homes			
At			
21 Elvetham Bridge, Fleet, Hampshire, GU51 1AF			

Update:

The application relates to the siting of four mobile homes; however, it is noted that one touring caravan has been removed from the site. Therefore, the application should relate to the siting of three mobile homes.

Speaker Details

No registered speakers.

Item No:	12	Reference No:	21/02937/FUL
Installation of an energy storage facility comprising of battery containers, fencing, switching station, kiosk and associated works.			
At			
Penn Croft Farm, Penn Croft, Crondall, Farnham, GU10 5PX			

Update:

Amendment to recommended conditions, specifically condition 2 and the approved drawings to refer to a Site Contour Plan.

Condition amended to:

The development hereby permitted shall be fully implemented in accordance with the following submitted application plans and drawings numbered (including any mitigation / enhancement recommended therein):

Site Contours Model of BESS (407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T00011 P01.00)

(received 24th November 2021)

Noise Impact Assessment prepared by Hepworth Acoustics P21-026-R01v3 October 2021

Transport Statement prepared by Banners Gate Transportation Ltd Version 2 dated October 2021 Tree data (unnumbered)

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prepared by Brindle and Green dated October 2021 Ref: BG21.167.2

Topographic Survey (S219 1212) 407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00008 P02.00

Inverter Detailed Plan and Elevations 407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00007 P02.00

Auxiliary Transformer Detailed Plan and Elevations 407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00003 P04.00

Elevations 407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00004-Rev03

Battery Container Elevations (BESS Detailed Plan and Elevations) 407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00005 P02.00

DNP Kiosk Details Plan and Elevations 407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00006-Rev002 – 11KV DNO Kiosk Detailed Plan and Elevations

(received 15th November 2021)

407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00012 P04.00 Elevational View of Switch Yard

407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00002 P05.00 General Arrangement of Security Fencing

407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00001 P4.00 General Arrangement of BESS Vehicular Access for Construction Traffic on Itchel lane (P1563/12)

(received 3rd March 2022)

Ecology Buffer Plan 407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-000014 Rev A

Technical Note – Fire Safety Ecology Addendum R02 dated March 2022

(received 18th March 2022)

Soakage Test prepared by The Geo-Environmental Service Provider (as1) ref: 128-22-675.2715 letter dated 31st May 2022 Infiltration information (5 pages Micro Drainage)

Trail Pit Photos prepared by The Geo-Environmental Service Provider (as1) 128- 22-675 TP1 and TP2 Landscape Strategy Plan (21005254_PLN_LS_1.1)

(received 14th July 2022)

Planning, Design and Access Statement prepared by RCA regeneration dated 11th November 2021

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated April 2021 prepared by Brindle and Green BG21.167 Arboricultural Impact Assessment Survey and Report Rev 2 Report Reference: BG21.167.1 prepared by Brindle and Green.

Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Link Engineering NC-LE-GEN-XX-RP-CE FRA01-P1-Flood Risk Assessment dated March 2022 Addendum to Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Link Engineering NCC-LE GEN-XX-TN-CE-TN01 dated March 2022 (received 3rd October 2022) Arboricultural Survey Addendum dated October 2022

(received 18th October 2022)

Site Location Plan 407544-BVL-ZZ-00-DR-T-00010A P03

(received 2nd November 2022)

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the application form and associated details hereby approved.

Speaker Details

*Speaking For the Application; Ms Rebecca Lock

The applicant Mr Richard Calderone (from SSE Energy Solutions) to answer any questions from Members.