

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Date and Time:** Wednesday, 11 March 2020 at 7pm

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

**Present:**

### **COUNCILLORS**

Ambler, Blewett, Delaney, Kennett, Oliver (Chairman), Quarterman, Radley, Southern, Worlock

### **Officers:**

Emma Whittaker	Planning Manager
Maxine Lewis	Planning Enforcement Team Leader
Adam Maskell	Tree Officer
Tola Otudeko	Shared Legal Services
Gill Chapman	Committee Services
Helen Vincent	Committee Services

## **40 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

## **41 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies had been received from Councillors Cockarill and Wheale.

## **42 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

## **43 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None declared.

## **44 OBJECTION TO TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (ORD/19/00013) REGARDING THE COPPER BEECH AT 14 COXHEATH ROAD, TREE PRESERVATION ORDER, 2019**

The Committee was asked to consider one letter of objection to a TPO made at 14 Coxheath Road, Church Crookham.

After a query, it was confirmed that it was normal practice to put a TPO on a large tree which could be preserved. Members acknowledged the difficulties of the owner and the balance of appreciating the importance of trees and the rights of residents to enjoy their gardens and land.

After considering that the amenity to the community was not greater than the needs of the resident, Members decided against the Tree Preservation Order.

*Mr Geoff Day spoke against the Tree Preservation order.*

## **DECISION**

That TPO ORD/19/00013 (modified to “ORD/19/00014”) not be confirmed.

### **45 OBJECTION TO TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (ORD/19/00012) REGARDING THE DAWN REDWOOD AT STONEY COTTAGE TREE PRESERVATION ORDER, 2019**

The Committee were asked to consider two letters of objection, relating to a TPO which protected a single dawn redwood sited in the Odiham Conservation Area.

Members considered:

- This was a large tree with some capacity for some future growth, eg another third again
- There was no evidence of this species failing during storms due to their size
- There was no evidence that the tree is the cause of the crack in the wall
- If an application was made for the tree to be felled, the TPO had to be confirmed in order for conditions to be made for any replacement planting

*Mr David Osmond spoke against the Tree Preservation Order.*

## **DECISION**

That TPO ORD/19/00012 be confirmed without modification.

### **46 QUARTERLY UPDATE ON PLANNING ENFORCEMENT**

The Planning Committee received an overview of the Planning Enforcement function in the period October to December 2019 (Quarter 3).

Members considered the information, particularly the term ‘not expedient’, notable cases, loss of ‘open plan’ gardens, breaches, and enforcement against temporary structures. Members were also concerned about developers’ disproportionate use of Council resources in enforcement matters.

## **DECISION**

That the overview of the Enforcement function be noted.

### **47 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS**

Members accepted updates and considered the planning report from the Head of Place as attached.

The meeting closed at 8.27 pm

# HART DISTRICT COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Decision/Recommendations - 11 March 2020

**Item No: I01- 19/02756/HOU - 7 Broome Close, Yateley, GU46 7SY**

Erection of two storey side and rear extensions following demolition of single storey side and rear extensions and single storey side and rear wrap around conservatory. The application had been presented at Planning Committee as the agent was a District Councillor.

Members discussed the well screened plot, the very substantial extension and the effect on the street scene. After debate Members agreed that in light of the large plot a sizeable extension could be acceptable, but that the scale, mass and bulking of this application was far too much.

## DECISION - REFUSE

- I The scale, sitting, bulk and massing of the proposed two-storey side and rear extension would be an inappropriate form of development and would dominate and compete with the character of the host dwelling. The proposal would therefore fail to form a subservient addition to the main property which would result in material harm to the external appearance of the dwelling.

Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policies GEN1, GEN4 and URBI6 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, Emerging Local Plan Policy NBE10 of the Hart Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2016-2032 and advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019).

## Informatives

- I In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in dealing with this application, the Council had:
- considered the imposition of conditions and or the completion of a S106 legal agreement (in accordance with paragraphs 54-57). In addition:
  - The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received. Whilst permission has been refused, regard has been had to the presumption to approve sustainable development wherever possible, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
  - The applicant was provided with pre-application advice but did not follow the recommendations provided.

- In this instance it was considered that no amendments would be possible to overcome the reasons for refusal as they would have been too far removed from the scheme and therefore no engagement with the applicant was necessary.

Consequently, the proposal was unacceptable for the above reasons.

Note:

Robert Harward, Agent spoke for the application.

*Councillor Blewett left, and returned to, the room during this item.*

*Councillor Southern declared that he had friends with properties in Broome Close, though not adjacent to the property.*

**Item No: I02 - 20/00356/TPO** - Waverley House Waverley Avenue Fleet Hampshire GU51 4NN

This application had been brought to Planning Committee because the applicant was a District Councillor. As such, Officers did not have delegated authority to determine the application.

The property is within the North Fleet Conservation Area, as such, all trees of a certain size are protected. Some trees at this property are also protected by Tree Preservation Order ref: 01/01028/HDC. This particular application concerns only the trees protected by TPO; the others are dealt with under a separate Conservation Area notice (ref: 20/00416/CA).

The proposed works were:

- T1, T2 - Pine - Remove 1 lateral limb over phone line
- T3 - Oak - Side reduction by 20%
- T4 - Chestnut - Fell to ground level
- T5 - Chestnut - Deadwood
- T6 - Beech - Reduction by 20%
- T12 - T18 - Chestnuts - Crown lift and sever ivy
- T19 - Chestnut - Fell
- T20 - Beech - Reduction over property by 20%
- T21 - Chestnut - Fell

**DECISION - Grant**

## **CONDITIONS**

- I The work(s) shall be carried out in accordance with BS3998:2010 Tree Work - Recommendations

Reason: In order to ensure the works are carried out to an appropriate standard; in the interests of the health and appearance of the trees.