



admin@crookhamvillage.org.uk

These are the unadopted Minutes of a virtual Planning Committee Meeting of Crookham Village Parish Council, held at 7.30pm on Monday 21st September 2020. Please refer to the Parish Council Minutes of the next meeting for any alterations.

Present: Cllr David Jackson (Chairman)

Cllr Julia Ambler

Cllr Simon Amber

Cllr Andrew Friend

Cllr Stephen Bennett

Cllr Suzanne Barham

Mrs Angela Sayers

Mrs Lucy Norris

Public: None

1. Apologies for Absence.

None

2. Chairman's Announcements

None

3. Declarations by members of interests in items on the agenda.

None.

4. Consider Crime & Disorder Implications.

The Chairman reminded members of their duty to consider any crime and disorder implications that might arise from any decision that they might make at the meeting.

5. Public Participation (maximum of 3 minutes per speaker).

None.

6. Planning Application 20/01958/HOU

This application has been withdrawn.

7. Planning Application 20/02031/HOU

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension to facilitate the conversion of the attached garage to habitable accommodation.

at: 41 Barn Meadow Close, Church Crookham, Fleet, GU52 0YB.

RESOLVED

Objection

The proposal would reduce on-site parking from 3 to 2 against a Hart standard of 3 on-site spaces in zone 2. The Neighbourhood Plan adds further weight to this objection.

ACTION

Planning clerk to file response with HDC.

8. Planning application 20/02148/HOU

Proposal: To improve the existing conservatory with a new timber shingle roof, new grey Aluminum windows and insulated render to the existing walls.

at: Meadowside, Crondall Road, Crookham Village, Fleet, GU51

RESOLVED

No Objection

ACTION

Planning clerk to file response with HDC

9. Planning application 20/01878/HOU

Proposal: Erection of a single storey side extension to include attached garage following demolition of existing detached garage
at Studley, The Street, Crookham Village, Fleet, GU51 5SG

RESOLVED

No Objection subject to no objections from the Hart Arboriculturist.

ACTION

Planning Clerk to file response with HDC

10. Planning Consultations

Additional points in red expand initial draft answers to questions in the government consultation "Changes To The Current Planning System". The final submission to be agreed by email after the meeting for submission before the 1 October deadline.

Q1: No. The recent chaos with exam results should sound a significant warning about blunt-instrument algorithms in place of individual assessment.

Q2: Se Q1.

Q3, Q4, Q5: Not known. Does not distinguish between need and desire. Demand is not the best measure of housing need. Homeless counts would be an alternative.

Q6: No. Authorities which already have a plan, especially those whose plan were recently made, have a greater challenge to revise their plan than those not yet made.

Q7: Yes.

Q8: The frequent conflict between finance for essential off-site works and affordable housing requires policy guidance.

Q9, Q10, Q11: Points Raised

We do not agree.

We think it is more important that a certain percentage of housing are built rather than having cash.

We end up having loads of money but no sites to build on.

We are being given money rather than affordable housing.

Excess land prices are contributing to the financial challenge to develop to provide a sufficient proportion of homes.

Q12: Re para 56 - does the Planning Inspectorate have the resources to deal with a flood of revised, already-approved local plans?

add

Proper consideration needs to be given to the consultation period required where there are significant changes to plans.

Q13: Points Raised

This looks realistic if the criteria specify carefully who would qualify.

It needs to be controlled and monitored.

There should be some constraints on selling. Lessons should be learned from the effect of council house sales in the past. If houses are sold at a premium, they should pay back the discount received. Maybe apply a time frame, some sort of sliding scale up to 5 years.

There need to be control. Advantageous purchases should be prevented through a pay- back scheme.

Q14: Yes, but not in rural areas.

Q15: No. Exceptions should not encourage major developments that bypass the local plan process.

Q16: Yes. Existing Rural Exception Site policy should be retained.

Q17: No. Historic failure to provide off-site infrastructure to support existing developments has already caused huge problems that would be further exacerbated by relaxing the threshold. Encouraging a series of small sites with individual exceptions greatly risks an unacceptable cumulative infrastructure deficit.

Q18: Different areas will have different existing infrastructure deficits. Thresholds should be determined locally.

Q19: No for global policy. Size limits need to reflect local constraints.

Q20: Hastily- prepared development proposals rushed through the system are not a recipe for good outcomes. What support will be given to LPAs to cope with the prospective rush of applications?

Q21: Hidden cooperation between developers could easily game the system proposed.

Q22: Yes.

Q23: Encourage major developers to allocate plots on approved developments to SME builders.

Q24: Experience has shown that PRIOR approvals for conversions frequently result in substandard housing in unsuitable locations. Permission in Principle should only apply to sites which have already been designated in local plans.

Q25: The assumption that co-locating commercial and residential developments will result in the workforce living in the new development is flawed. The main result is two-way commuting (ie workers in to new commercial, residents out to old jobs) with major consequences for traffic flows.

Add

Assessment of local needs should precede any commercial development

Q26: No. It is essential that access and off-site infrastructure issues are addressed before any type of permission is granted.

Q27: Constraints on design set out in plans should be respected.

Q28: Many local newspapers have insufficient penetration to be a viable means of publicity. The web is also not universal. Postal notifications should be the norm for developments with the scope related to the size and area affected.

Q29, 30: No comment required

Q31: Yes.

Q32: Minimum design criteria to stop inappropriate conversion of commercial buildings into substandard flats with inadequate interior layout and facilities.

Q33, Q34: No comment required

Q35: Large-scale entry-level housing projects risk ghettoising the underprivileged.

ACTION

Planning clerk to email 1st draft answers by tomorrow

Councillors to review draft answers and advise Cllr Jackson of any changes before Sunday 27th

September 2020

Cllr Jackson to send response by 1st October.

11. Availability for the next planning meeting

All Cllrs at this meeting available for the meeting on the 19th October 2020

19/10/20

16/11/20

21/12/20

The meeting closed at 20.27pm.