

These are the unadopted Minutes of the extra-ordinary meeting of 8 December 2015 held in the Zebon Copse Centre, Danvers Drive, Crookham at 8pm. Please refer to the January 2016 Minutes for any amendments.

Present: Cllr. Simon Ambler  
Cllr. Julia Ambler  
Cllr. Peter Crawley  
Cllr. Clive Eastwood  
Cllr. David Jackson  
Cllr. Indra Sinka  
Cllr. Wendy Makepeace-Browne  
Mrs. Carol Leversha (Clerk)

In attendance: Ward Cllrs. Jenny Radley and Tony Clarke and Cllr. Stephen Parker (Leader of HDC). There were approximately 58 residents and also some interested members of the public in attendance.

**208/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies from Cllr. Richard Eastment.

**209/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman explained the purpose of this evenings meeting.

**210/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA & DELEGATION OF DISPENSATION TO THE PROPER OFFICER (CLERK)**

All Members who believe they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting must declare that interest and, having regard to the circumstances described in Part 3 Paragraph 1.5 of the Parish Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter is discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore all Members with a Non-Pecuniary interest in a matter being considered at the meeting should consider whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 2 of the Code, consider whether it is appropriate to leave the meeting while the matter is discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

**211/15 PRESENTATION ON HART DISTRICT COUNCIL'S CONSULTATION ON REFINED HOUSING OPTIONS PAPER (which has in excess of 900 dwellings on sites within the parish in addition to the 330 dwellings recently granted at Appeal for Albany Park)**

The Chairman advised the meeting that what will be covered this evening is a brief run through on the process, a little bit of information on what is happening with the Neighbourhood Plan and Cllr. Jackson will give an update on the PreApp for the Watery Lane development.

The Chairman gave the background to why this process was running. He advised that a great deal of what he is presenting this evening is attributable to other interested parties as well as what was taken from the Hart Council website. He presented a graph showing availability of sites and said that a lot of misinformation had been going around about brownfield sites. All sites have to be available and the landowner has to be willing to offer them up. He mentioned the protected SPA area amongst others and said that all were detailed in the documents. He advised that local gaps will not be protected in the new plan and the CV Conservation Area will have to be examined to see if it has sufficient merit to retain as a Conservation area. After sites have been allocated then local gaps can be pursued. Hart will only decide on suitable polices once the local housing need has been assessed and met. He then presented a slide relating to questions 1 and 2 on the actual document – questions further on ask you to express a preference on ranking and there are areas to allow you to make comments. What is stressed is that this is a consultation and quality of responses is most important not just quantities. He then detailed the settlement hierarchy and advised that Crookham and Crondall fit into tier 4. However part of the parish fits into another tier which makes things more complicated. On the response to the questionnaire you are asked whether you accept that ranking. At this point questions were asked about the implications of being in tier 1 (classed as urban and most suitable for further development) if you had a view on that and wanted it reclassified you should put it in the response. A resident asked about the criteria for that ranking and the Chairman advised that these rankings were arrived at as part of national guidance. He said he would ask HDC to explain on what they base the criteria on and would put the reply on the CVPC website.

Cllr. Radley said these are tiers identified by HDC back in 2010 and gave a detailed explanation. The Chairman said that the tier 1 part of the parish was defined as such because the infrastructure is already there. In response to further comments the Chairman said it was important to respond as you feel is correct.

Question 4 of the consultation is asking which approaches residents think should be chosen. Approach 1 is to disperse development estimated at 2,000 throughout towns and villages. Tiers 2 to 4 with the exception of Winchfield. Within approach 1 for Crookham Village Parish on the dispersal strategy there is one site which is Cross Farm which has an estimated capacity of 150 dwellings.

Approach 2 is to have a strategic Urban extension giving 2,000 houses it is focussed on two main settlements to the west side of Fleet 800 at Pale Lane and 450 at Grove Farm (which is this parish) and the other 730 are over near Hook. This is a strategy consultation - it is asking you for preferences.

Approach 3 is focussed growth on a new settlement which is aimed at Winchfield which is estimated at up to 5,000. From a parish perspective we have sympathy for Winchfield because we would not wish to see greenfield development on this scale but without Winchfield coming forward this would mean that SHLAA sites in the villages would be developed.

A resident asked about developments providing more schools/shops etc. if development goes ahead on the outskirts of Fleet. The Chairman said wherever development was put there will always be a wish to provide the infrastructure. HCC have to provide the schools – as a parish we support a new settlement option which would provide schools/retail etc. A resident asked at what point could Hart influence housing mix so that we did not just get Berkeley homes with £750k housing when we need homes for our children. The Chairman said that was a long way down the line.

Question 5 – then it gets more complicated because on the assumption that more than one option needs to be followed (because of the 10 year lead in time for a new settlement) you are asked for opinions as to why you might take these approaches.

In response to further questions the Chairman explained about the duty to co-operate. The Chairman was then asked to explain the viability of sites – the Chairman advised that the Parish Council had responded in support of a new settlement followed by small sites around the district as its preferred choice. Bearing in mind we are sandwiched between QEB, Watery lane and Hitches Lane there may be a justifiable comment from people living in the parish for people to say in the comments that we should be looking at what the impact will be on the area with traffic, sewage etc. There is probably 8 years of building to be finished before we know what the impact will be. Cllr. Makepeace-Browne explained that Surrey Heath/Rushmoor and Hart Councils have to work together under the duty to co-operate. She pressed residents to engage with the Neighbourhood Plan so that residents had a say in where development should go rather than having it imposed on the Parish.

The Chairman said an 8 page summary booklet on the Housing Options Consultation is being delivered to every household in the coming week. One lady said she found it very disheartening and thought it was a done deal. She wanted to contribute but she knew jolly well it would not matter an ounce.

The Chairman said the whole push for this plan is to get policies in place so that when something like Watery Lane comes forward you could use those policies to say that “sorry you are not on an allocated site and refuse such development.”

The Chairman advised that postcodes had to be entered on the consultation otherwise those responses would not be counted. Weighting will be given to your postcode to show you are looking at what affects your area and spot checks will be carried out.

Question 6 – is relative to a new homes sites booklet which is a separate document which has detailed maps for all the SHLAA sites. Cross Farm is a shortlisted site and at the top is the site which comes within the category Urban Extension. Cllr. Jackson said the residents should look at a wider area and comment because effectively you only have one site to rank and that is a nonsense.

Comment was made that only those present this evening would have the benefit of this presentation and would be ill-informed to respond to the Consultation. In response to a question about flooding issues the Chairman advised that when the sites were assessed flood prone sites were rejected. Cllr. Jackson said if you put Hart settlement into google you will get the definition of tiers.

The way the Plan is moving forward Hart will not be looking at each parish to take development but have to look at the SHLAA sites across the district. The Chairman then explained how a Neighbourhood Plan can influence where development takes place and what it should look like and said once sites have been allocated we can then look at designating green spaces. Neighbourhood Plans do not prevent development. A gentleman from Winchfield said if Winchfield is accepted this then leaves spare capacity to accept the needs of Surrey Heath & Rushmoor and it should be understood that residents of such a new development will not all go by train they will use cars and that means more congestion on our roads.

## **212/15 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chairman had permitted questions and responded to them during the course of his presentation.

## **213/15 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING PRESENTATION**

The Chairman then advised the meeting that there is a website specifically for the Neighbourhood Plan and there are Members of that group here this evening who would be happy to engage with you. Mr. Richard Hellier is a Member of the Neighbourhood Plan Group – he is a landscape architect and specialises in integrating development into a landscape. He then gave the floor to Mr. Hellier who presented several slides explaining the process in relation to the Grove Farm SHLAA site. He had looked at several options for integrating new housing in the least damaging way to the landscape and explained how each could be achieved. He then went on to the Cross Farm SHLAA site and identified prominent points which make the site special. He had identified a marginal ring of smaller settlements. There was some dissent to the sites proposed because of infrastructure issues. One lady said there is provision in the NPPF for trade off of biodiversity mitigation (she is employed on such issues worldwide) and knows how it should be done. She wants to know where it could be put – in the Neighbourhood Plan or the Local Plan.

At the conclusion of Mr. Hellier's presentation the Chairman then invited Cllr. Jackson to make comments on the PreApp for Watery Lane. Cllr. Jackson presented a slide which showed what the developer is putting in for layout. Four distinct areas of urban housing which are quite cramped – an area fronting Redfield's Lane for retail and health with a large hardstanding car park. He advised that it was the Parish Council's view (at last night's Council meeting) that semi-industrial buildings and a car park do not protect the rural view. At the top end of the site the developer has yet to lay out the sports facilities and the Parish Council want those facilities moved further away from this Centre so it does not impact on our car park and the MUGA because of the lighting and noise for neighbouring properties.

The Chairman brought the meeting to a conclusion and invited any interested parties to join the Neighbourhood Plan Group.

The meeting closed at 10 pm.