

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Date and Time:** Wednesday 18 January 2023 at 7.00 pm

**Place:** Council Chamber

**Present:**

Quarterman (Chairman), Oliver (Vice-Chairman), Cockarill, Forster, Kennett, Makepeace-Browne, Radley, Southern and Worlock

**In attendance:**

Councillor Smith

**Officers:**

Mark Jaggard, Executive Director Place

Stephanie Baker, Development Management & Building Control Manager

Tola Otudeko, Shared Legal Services

Kathryn Pearson, Principal Planner

Aimee Harris, Senior Planner

Matthew Harris, Planning Policy Officer

Alex Jones, Flood Risk Management Officer

Jenny Murton, Committee Services and Members Officer

### **55 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

### **56 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies had been received from Councillor Blewett.

### **57 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Kennett declared that he knew the applicant for item 7. (22/02641/FUL Zenas, Reading Road, Hook). This was considered a non-prejudicial interest.

### **58 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman announced that on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2023 the Council accepted a nomination from The Yateley Society to list The Anchor Inn as an Asset of Community Value. The designation, which lasts for 5 years, will give community organisations the time to put together a bid to purchase the public house should the owner decide to list it for sale.

Located on Vigo Lane, Yateley, The Anchor Inn has been a focal point of the local community for over 150 years, providing a place for residents to meet and

socialise. In recent years, The Anchor Inn has hosted a variety of community and charity events in support of residents and charitable causes.

## **59 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS**

The planning reports from the Executive Director, Place were considered and the updates via the Addendum were accepted.

## **60 22/02554/FUL - 10 RICHMOND CLOSE, FLEET, HAMPSHIRE, GU52 7UJ**

The Senior Planner summarised the application as demolition of an existing garage and erection of a 3-bedroom detached bungalow.

Members questioned and discussed:

- If the officer's recommendation to refuse a previous application for the site, was made under delegated powers with the benefit of a site visit and it was confirmed it was.
- The correct SPA identified in the officer's report and whether it should be Hawley Road as opposed to Yateley.
- The reasons for the refusal of the previous application in August - officers confirmed the reasons were similar to this.
- The footprint of the plot/application.
- The square footage of the existing building and what would remain of it if the application were permitted.
- If the option of having two bedrooms had been considered.
- The size of neighbouring properties on the close and how this build would compare.
- How cramped would the build appear from the road if permitted.
- How the Council's Local Plan encourages and is keen to increase more bungalow stock in the district.
- The location of the site and it's distance to local amenities and schools.

Members debated:

- The size of the proposed plot and how it would affect the existing street scene.
- The desire for preservation of bungalows in Fleet and the opportunity to increase bungalow stock.
- Slight concern with remaining size of the dwelling and plot.
- The conditions that could be added to disallow additional storeys to be built at a later date.
- The location and that it's within walking distance to local amenities and schools.
- The overall appearance of the proposed development.
- The potential for SANG/SAMM mitigation to be secured within a reasonable two-week timeframe.

The Chairman proposed the Officer's recommendation to **Refuse** and was seconded by Councillor Oliver. Members undertook a recorded vote, and the results were:

*For: None*

*Against: Cockarill, Forster, Kennett, Makepeace-Browne, Oliver, Radley, Southern and Worlock.*

*Abstention: Quarterman*

Officer's recommendation to **Refuse** was not carried.

The Chairman proposed a revised motion to **Grant**.

Members discussed:

- Changing the SPA designation in the application.
- The removal of permitted development rights via planning condition so extra storeys or loft conversions would not be allowed in the future.

The Development Management & Building Control Manager explained more detail on SANG provisions and the other conditions that could be placed on the application if permitted. They included:

- Listing external materials
- Surface water drainage scheme
- Soft landscaping and the biodiversity net gain
- Parking conditions for the existing dwelling and new dwelling
- Construction hours
- Permitted development rights removal for roof alterations.

Members questioned the use of solar panels and heat pumps and if this could be enforced in the application. It was confirmed that this cannot be conditioned or enforced on every proposal, and the use of low-carbon technology for heating and power is required by the new Building Regulations that were published last June in any event.

Councillor Radley proposed a revised motion to **Grant** and this was seconded by Councillor Forester.

Members unanimously voted For the revised motion, and **Grant**, subject to conditions discussed was carried.

**DECISION – GRANT**, subject to conditions discussed and securing of SANG and SANG payments within two weeks.

*Notes:*

*A site visit was carried out on Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> January, as set out in the Addendum paper.*

*Simon Port spoke For the application.*

**61 22/02641/FUL - ZENAS, READING ROAD, HOOK, HAMPSHIRE, RG27 9ED**

The Principal Planner summarised the application as erection of a detached four-bedroom house, a detached three-bedroom house and a detached cycle store, following demolition of the two existing buildings; partial demolition of Building 1 and conversion to a garage; provision of amenity space, parking, hard and soft landscaping, and associated flood mitigation works.

Members questioned:

- The culvert and its underground section, including the location in respect of the site's curtilage.
- Whether the site was in flood zone 2 or 3.
- Whether markers for flood levels placed on the site by the applicant were accurate.
- That the site had been an eyesore for a considerable period of time.
- The other reasonably available sites within the defined search area of Hook Settlement Policy Boundary or its immediate surrounds, which the Council considered would meet the requirements from a sequential flood risk perspective.
- The ownership of these two additional sites, Brown Croft and Geffery's House and whether that was material to the consideration.
- Whether a lack of objection from the Environment Agency was pertinent in Sequential Test assessments.
- Pre-application discussions for alternative uses for the site including commercial.
- Whether different types of use would potentially meet the Sequential Test for development on this site.
- The high amount of recent rainfall and that on the site visit the water levels in the culvert appeared low.
- The definitions of flood zones 2 and 3A.
- Whether resolving to grant this application would be a departure from the Local Plan policy NBE5 and the procedure and implications of this.
- The area of search for reasonably available sites.
- Whether, if the Sequential Test is not passed, could the development proceed anyway.
- Fine balance between re-development and flood risk.

Members questioned the markers that they had observed on the site visit and the modelling work, and the Flood Risk Management Officer confirmed these were acceptable.

The Flood Risk Management Officer also confirmed that the Environment Agency does not respond to Sequential Tests, as its responsibility lies with the relevant Local Authority.

Members debated:

- The appearance of the proposed site currently, that it is an eyesore, and the benefits of re-development.
- The benefits to residents if the site appearance was improved.
- If flood risk were not an issue, there would be no other concerns with re-development.
- That there must be very good reason to depart from officers' professional advice and the first refusal, a very recent material planning consideration.
- The design of the proposed house and that it was of a good quality.
- The devastation that flooding of homes can cause to residents.
- Whether the site was flat and if re-grading of gardens would change the status and remove designation in flood zones 2 and 3.
- Distances of the site to the two reasonably available sites in flood zone 1.
- The floorplan of the house and the potential impact of landscape gardening on a Sequential Test result.
- Legal implications of granting permission contrary to Sequential Test result, LPA standard approach to the assessment and Hart Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2016 notes area of search could be district wide.

The Executive Director, Place reminded the committee of the Council's Climate Change Emergency declaration, the relevant detail within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 21) relevant to this application, and guidance contained within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 'Flood Risk and Coastal Change'.

The Development Management & Building Control Manager clarified policy NBE5 Managing Flood Risk, Planning Practise Guidance for sequential test and reasonably available alternative sites and the Hart Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2016.

Shared Legal Services clarified the Government guidance to the Committee in terms of Planning Practise Guidance for Sequential Test. [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk) ([Flood risk assessment: the sequential test for applicants - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk))

Members undertook a recorded vote on the Officer's recommendation to **Refuse** and this was carried. The results were:

*For: Cockarill, Oliver, Quarterman and Radley.*

*Against: Forster, Southern and Worlock*

*Abstention: Kennett and Makepeace-Browne*

## **DECISION – REFUSE**

*Notes:*

*A site visit was carried out on Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> January, as set out in the Addendum paper.*

*Ian Lasseter OBO Lasseter Downie Planning, spoke For the application.*

The meeting closed at 8.47 pm