

These are the unadopted Crookham Village Parish Council Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, 6 February 2017 held at 7.45pm in the WI Hall, The Street, Crookham Village. Please refer to the Minutes of the March meeting for any amendments.

Present: Cllr. Simon Ambler (Chairman)
Cllr. Julia Ambler
Cllr. Clive Eastwood
Cllr. David Jackson
Cllr. Dr. Indra Sinka
Mrs. Angela Sayers (RFO)
Mrs. Carol Leversha (Clerk)

In attendance: Hart Ward Cllr. Jenny Radley and Mr. Peter Kenaghan, Mrs. Ann Allen, Mr Jeremy Bates and Mr. Oliver Robson.

MIN.020/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

County Cllr. Bennison had sent his apologies.

MIN.021/17 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

MIN.022/17 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9 JANUARY 2017

The Chairman referred to these page by page.

RESOLVED: Min. 001/17 to 010/17 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

MIN.023/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA & DELEGATION OF DISPENSATION TO THE PROPER OFFICER (CLERK)

The Chairman advised Members to consider whether they had any disclosable interest in matters on the Agenda and if so to declare them now or at the appropriate point on the Agenda. The Chairman declared that he had a personal and non-pecuniary interest in the application for Cross Farm in that he was Chairman of the Hart Council Planning Committee which would be dealing with this in due course. He would take no part in the debate or recommendation made.

MIN.024/17 CONSIDER CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

The Chairman reminded Members of their obligation to consider crime and disorder implications on any decision they might make at this meeting.

MIN.025/17 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (maximum of 3 minutes per speaker).

The Chairman asked permission to adjourn the meeting for public participation. Mrs. Allen asked if the Local Plan was to be discussed this evening and was advised no. Cllr. Jenny Radley advised that the No 10 bus route, which goes through the parish, has a timetable change due to road works in Farnborough. New timetables are available from Hart Council Offices in Reception. She also wished to emphasise that there is a HDC Cabinet this Thursday on the Local Plan Preferred Strategy to look at proposals and put it up for public consultation and it would be very important for this parish to respond. Mrs. Allen raised some questions and was advised to look at HDC website and then at meetings and agendas she would be able to look at the paper. Mr Robson asked about where the Cross Farm application had come from and was advised that it might be one that would be dealt with at the Cabinet meeting on Thursday and if it goes through that meeting it will have a long local consultation. He was asked if there was any point in raising issues before Thursday. Cllr. Simon Ambler advised that the Members of Cabinet would be the ones to make the decision as to what goes out to consultation and there is an opportunity to speak during the public participation. Mrs. Allen asked who had made the decision that Cross Farm should be included and Winchfield excluded. The Chairman advised her to look at the website for details of the Cabinet Members. Mr. Robson said he would be emailing the Cabinet members. Mrs Allen asked if the site had an audit trail to show how Cross Farm had come to the position it was now in. The Chairman said it is all there but it is not simple to follow. The Chairman then reconvened the meeting.

MIN.026/17 CO-OPTION TO FILL THREE COUNCILLOR VACANCIES

Notices have been posted again on all Parish noticeboards. There are still 3 vacancies and Cllr. Jackson said that Mr. Kernaghan was attending as an observer for this meeting.

MIN.027/17 NEWSLETTER

The Chairman said he is still working on his report for the newsletter and will be doing a job description for Councillors in it. Cllr. Jackson asked the Clerk to send details of the ACVs for his article.

MIN.028/17 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Cllr. Julia Ambler said they were no further forward due to dealing with the Cross Farm application – interestingly a lot has come out of the work on Cross Farm which will be useful. In response to a comment about adopted Neighbourhood Plans the meeting was advised that the Odiham one had been accepted and had chosen sites for inclusion which would be counted in the Local Plan. Other parishes had not gone site specific, as was the case with this Parish. Our neighbourhood plan had not wanted to identify sites because of the Albany Farm application and the general feeling was that people did not want further development. The Chairman said any help that anyone can offer to assist with the Neighbourhood Plan would be gratefully received. One very important issue was the landscape and environmental area for which the Steering Group are in need of help. Cllr. Julia Ambler said we do not need bald statements we need to gather evidence of existence - eg there are skylarks nesting – we need numbers and where they are actually nesting. She advised that the next meeting of the Steering Group would be Monday, 13 February at 8pm in the ZCC meeting room.

MIN.029/17 FINANCE

(i) Report from RFO

Cheques were presented for signature and duly signed.

January 2017 Income and Expenditure:

Income

Hire of Facilities	£4,184.17
Hire of Pitches	267.50

	£4,451.67

Expenditure

Asset Maintenance & Repairs	£2,184.22
Office Expenses	289.29
Printing, postage and advertising	£1,211.30
Professional fees	42.40
Property Maintenance	£2,808.18
Property Services	£1,062.11
Salaries	£3,786.20
Section 137	806.30
Subscriptions	91.00

Total Expenditure before Reserves transfers £12,281.00

Reserve Transfers

Transfer to Reserve for NP	-£1,211.30
----------------------------	------------

(ii) Budget for 2017/18 & setting of Precept

The RFO said that at the informal budget meeting a figure had been agreed for the Precept which now requires signatures. The Chairman expressed his thanks on behalf of all Members for the work which the RFO had done to present the budget at the informal meeting and we now needed to formally ratify.

RESOLVED: The budget for 2017/18 was agreed.

RESOLVED: The Precept was agreed and set at £125,172 which is just under 2% on the current figure.

(iii) Pensions Update

The RFO had presented a report to Members with the recommendation from Menzies as follows:

Pension provider – Nest Corporation

Contribution Tier – Set 2 basic pay (YE 31.3.18 contribution rate 1% ers 1% ee, YE 31.3.19 contribution rate 2% ers 3% ee, YE 31.3.20 expected contribution rate ers 3% ee5%)

Scheme – Trust based scheme

Initial charge to employer is nil - Nest do reserve the right to review this position in the future

Regular charge to employer is nil - Nest do reserve the right to review this position in the future

Annual management charge to members of .30% of fund value

Regular charge to members of 1.8% of each contribution paid

Pensionable pay will be basic salary

Minimum employer contribution rate of 1% gross

Minimum employee contribution rate of 1% gross (0.8% net)

Contributions will increase in line with the legislative minima until 2019 levels of 3% gross from the employer plus 5% gross (4% net) from the employee

Crookham Village PC are obliged by law to pay contributions to the pensions scheme provider by no later than 22nd of the month following deduction from salary.

The form is to proceed on this basis. Once the form is signed she sets up the software and forms with Nest and it will commence 1st April. She asked for Members to give their approval for the setting up of a direct debit in relation to the pension scheme this evening.

RESOLVED: Authority is given to proceed with Menzies recommendation as detailed above and the RFO is authorised with setting up the system and to initiate a direct debit with the bank.

(iv) Website Design Quote for ZCC

Cllr. Jackson had a meeting with the Managers and they had followed up with some suggestions as a result of which he will produce a report for the Finance meeting. It is hoped to then go out to tender.

MIN.030/17 PLANNING

(i) Report of the Planning Committee

Cllr. Jackson spoke to his report. The big news is the Appeal for Grove Farm due to non-determination and he wishes to put on record his disappointment that it had reached this stage. He had discovered on a website that if we can evidence a “valued local landscape” it counted with an Inspector in a recent appeal decision. Cllr. Jackson will email the link. In relation to the Grove Farm appeal the start date is 3 February and if anyone has anything to say about Grove Farm the cut-off date is 17 March. Full details on the Planning inspectorate website. He has not been able to get to the bottom of the S106 for Knight Close and nothing has come of it so he will remove it from the report.

RESOLVED: The Report of the Planning Committee was accepted.

Cllr. Simon Ambler took no part in the debate or recommendation made for the following application.

- (ii) **Confirm response to Hart Council on Planning Application 16/03400/OUT - Proposal: Hybrid application for the construction of a 160 unit Care Village incorporating a 64-bed Care Home (Use Class C2) and central facilities building, together with associated vehicular and pedestrian accesses, junction improvements, estate roads, parking areas and garages, footpaths/cycleways and landscape works, with full details of change of use of agricultural land and woodland to provide an area of public open space (Site of Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) and means of access to the site.**
At Cross Farm House, Crondall Road, Crookham Village, Fleet, GU51 5SS
 Cllr. Jackson spoke to this item and asked for views on the comments he has circulated and was advised that with a small amendment from Cllr. Eastwood (which he spoke to) the response was supported.
RESOLVED: The reasons for recommending refusal for this application were supported by Members and details are attached at Appendix A.
- (iii) **HDC 17/00041/HOU - Single storey side and rear extension 55 Netherhouse Moor, Church Crookham, Fleet GU51 5TZ**
 Cllr. Jackson introduced this application.
RESOLVED: Members had no objections.
- (iv) **HDC 17/00046/HOU - Proposed ground floor rear extension replacing existing conservatory 92 Netherhouse Moor, Church Crookham, Fleet, GU51 5TY**
 Cllr. Jackson introduced this application. Cllr. Eastwood raised a concern which Cllr. Jackson allayed.
RESOLVED: Members had no objections.
- (v) **HDC 17/00080 – Proposed single storey rear extension to the existing attached single garage to form additional garage facility to the two-storey detached residential dwelling. The Beck, Watery Lane, Church Crookham, Fleet, GU52 0RN**
 Cllr. Jackson introduced this application.
RESOLVED: Members had no objections.
- (vii) **HDC 17/00187/HOU – Demolition of existing rear workshop and single storey and first floor extension in the roof space to garage 22 Levignen Close, Church Crookham, Fleet, GU52 0TW**
 Cllr. Jackson introduced this application.
RESOLVED: Members had no objection.
- (viii) **HDC 17/00109/LBC – Replacement of existing conservatory, link corridor, shed and store with new garden room, porch and detached garage. The Old Hornes, Redfields Lane, Church Crookham, Fleet, GU52 0RA**
 Cllr. Jackson introduced this application.
RESOLVED: Members had no objections.

MIN.031/17

(i) Parish Lengthsman Contract

The meeting took place with HCC highways and the Legal Agreement has been adapted and awaits confirmation from HCC that it can now be signed. A contract and work schedule between the Contractor and CVPC has been drawn up and will be effective from 1 March 2017. Cllr. Eastwood had put his queries in writing and we await confirmation of the response from HCC. The Clerk was requested to get prices for a lockable storage container to keep our highway road signs stored at the Centre. Cllr. Jackson wished to attend the tour of sites to be dealt with when the contract is effective.

MIN.032/17

ZEBON COMMUNITY CENTRE & ADJACENT AMENITIES

(i) Report from Centre Manager

Report noted.

MIN.033/17

INFORMATION SHARING & AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

Cllr. Jackson said he will be relinquishing his Chairmanship of ZCRA on 22 February and there will no longer be that linkage with the ZCRA. The Chairman asked if they had requested the usual use of the Centre and Grounds foc and RFO will send the form to Cllr. Jackson. Cllr. Radley asked about f/p one and the barbed wire and muddy condition – was

the norm in wet weather. Cllr. Radley said she had raised concerns with the Ecology Officer at Hart because the boggyess of the site does not make the SANG suitable.

MIN.034/17 EXCLUSION OF PRESS & PUBLIC under schedule 12A Section 1001 LGA 1972

The Chairman proposed exclusion of press and public so that sensitive information could be debated for the next Agenda item.

RESOLVED: Public and Press were invited to leave.

MIN.035/17 STAFF REMUNERATION

The Chairman reminded Members that this had been debated at the informal budget meeting and it was proposed that a bonus be awarded to each of the Centre Managers in recognition of exemplary work standards. The Chairman wished to propose an amendment to that proposal and to the budget which we have just approved as he wishes to recognise the extra workloads of both the RFO and Clerk over the past year and that they both be awarded a bonus.

RESOLVED: All members of staff be awarded a bonus payable with their next pay cheque.

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm.

Dates for 2017 meetings:

WI HALL

3 April
10 April (Annual Parish Meeting)
5 June
4 September
6 November

ZEBON COMMUNITY CENTRE

6 March
8 May (Annual General Meeting)
3 July
2 October
4 December

APPENDIX A

Crookham Village Parish Council OBJECTS to

16/03400/OUT Hybrid application for the construction of a 160 unit Care Village incorporating a 64-bed Care Home (Use Class C2) and central facilities building, together with associated vehicular and pedestrian accesses, junction improvements, estate roads, parking areas and garages, footpaths/cycleways and landscape works, with full details of change of use of agricultural land and woodland to provide an area of public open space (Site of Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG)) and means of access to the site.

at Cross Farm House Crondall Road Crookham Village Fleet GU51 5SS
for the following reasons:

1. EFFECT ON CONSERVATION AREA

- 1.1. The proposal is for a large plot of uniform urban housing plus a number of large buildings across rising land immediately behind the varied (both in style and historic importance with no one style dominating) housing along The Street and Crondall Road on greenfield land outside the settlement boundary. This is completely out of character with the linear, varied form of Crookham Village and its Conservation Area.
- 1.2. Because of rising ground from The Street into the site (see Figure 1), the proposed development would have a significant dominating and detrimental effect on the settings of the 8 Grade II listed buildings immediately bordering the site and would be visible from the many Grade II and locally listed buildings along the North side of The Street. The detrimental visual intrusion would be even more pronounced due to night lighting on the site because of rising ground into the site and also because current Crookham Village street lighting is deliberately minimal to preserve the character of the village.
- 1.3. Buildings along the line of the ridge running WNW from the top of the hill would be especially intrusive on the skyline both from the village and from the lower reaches of the SANG.



Figure 1: Rising ground (orange = Conservation Areas)

- 1.4. This development would dominate Crookham Village by its footprint, by the huge percentage increase in the number of buildings and by introducing a large block of uniform urban housing which is alien to the existing built environment in the Conservation Area.
- 1.5. The proposed access would have a significant detrimental effect on the visual street scene at Crossways due to removal of a prominent oak in front of the Grade II listed Cross Farm Cottages and the hedge in front of Cross Farm House as well as opening up a wider access track. The loss of parking space for Cross Farm House would also be significant.
- 1.6. This application is therefore contrary to saved policies GEN1, CON13, CON22 and RUR2.

2. GAP

- 2.1. As a self-contained, urban ‘village’ immediately adjacent to the old established Crookham Village the perception of the existing population is of a separate ‘town’ right on their doorstep with little synergy with its surroundings.
- 2.2. The original aim of the gap was to inhibit expansion of the urban area of Church Crookham. This application proposes an urban intrusion from the other direction.
- 2.3. Due to its location, size and density the proposed development is an urban intrusion into the gap that separates Crookham Village from adjacent urban sprawl. Because this large and dominant site would be back land development immediately adjacent to the village, the gap would effectively be completely closed notwithstanding the developer’s optimistic assertion that the site only occupies a small proportion of the gap specified in the existing Local Plan.
- 2.4. Over time, as the initial population gets older and less mobile, integration of the two populations will become even more problematic.
- 2.5. Views from the two public footpaths crossing the site would be very significantly degraded with half of each open section of the current footpaths running through or beside urban housing on the site which would further emphasise the gross intrusion into the gap
- 2.6. This application is therefore contrary to saved policy CON21 in that it threatens the ‘separate identity of a smaller settlement’ listed under CON21.

3. ACCESS

- 3.1. The application states that it seeks full permission for access. It is not clear whether this applies to the main access into the site or also to access to the proposed SANG car park. CVPC objects to both.

- 3.2. Crossways junction is immediately adjacent to the proposed main access. Proximity of the main access to this very busy junction (especially during peak hours), the demographics of the proposed residents (many of whom will be forced to use their cars due to lack of appropriate public transport), plus the use of the access by large vehicles servicing the site both during construction and thereafter, mean that road safety would be unacceptably compromised and access during peak hours likely to be compromised.
- 3.3. Main access would be immediately adjacent to the Grade II listed Cross Farm Cottages which, due to their age and lack of foundations, are extremely vulnerable to the detrimental effect of vibrations caused by heavy goods traffic.
- 3.4. Changes required to accommodate the main access would also have a significant detrimental effect on the street scene in the Conservation Area.
- 3.5. Overall, CVPC considers that the proposed main access is in an unacceptable location.
- 3.6. Unsuitability of the SANG access is covered later.

4. TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

- 4.1. The travel plan makes much of walking and cycling, neither of which are likely to feature significantly in the travel plans of their proposed demographic, the more so as time passes.
- 4.2. The travel plan is based on bus services in July 2016. Local bus services were re-organised from 1 September 2016. There are now no regular bus routes near the site except for the run to Farnborough College out at 0800 and back at 1630 during term time only, which is not a useful service for this development of older people.
- 4.3. The nearest active bus stop is now for the No10 bus near the junction of Coxheath Road and Crookham Road, at least 20 minutes' walk from the site entrance (plus an allowance for the reduced walking speed of older people).
- 4.4. The travel plan makes no mention of providing dedicated transport such as a minibus, although this is mentioned in passing elsewhere.
- 4.5. Parking provision is based on HCC standards, which fall below provisions required by HDC parking standards for the rural location. No provision has been made for the likely numbers of 2-car households, especially for the younger end of the demographic and those who continue working as the pension age increases well beyond the proposed minimum age criterion.
- 4.6. The travel plan is based on 15 FTE staff (23-31 total)^[Transport Statement para 4.1.2] working 3 shifts, yet elsewhere in the paperwork employment of 60-80 people^[CCVLTLD Statement p46] is mentioned and elsewhere^[CCVLTLD Statement p54] 85-100. It is also asserted^[Transport Statement Table 7-1] that 31% of employees will be non-car drivers, for whom no obvious

plans^[Transport Statement Table 8-1] have been made to get them to work given the lack of public transport. The basis of estimates of both staff travel and staff parking is very suspect and hence of the overall traffic implications.

4.7. Despite assertions to the contrary, a closed pub (The Black Horse closed recently and there is no guarantee of it re-opening) and a single village store/postoffice/tearoom hardly amounts to adequate facilities for a new settlement to rely on.

5. CVPC concludes that the travel plan is insufficiently robust and that therefore the site is unsustainable and hence contrary to the NPPF.

6. UNSUSTAINABLE LOCATION

6.1. Put together, the above objections demonstrate that this would not be a sustainable location for the majority of occupants of this ‘care village’.

7. DEMOGRAPHIC

7.1. The population of Crookham Village is already skewed towards the older end of the age range.

7.2. Adding a self-contained urban care village restricted to an older initial population that will steadily age over time will produce an even more skewed age profile for the area with inevitable skewing of any local facilities towards the older population. The effect will be to make the old village less and less attractive to younger incomers and hence further compound the existing demographic problem.

8. LANDSCAPE

8.1. The application asserts that *“there are no non-statutory or local designations indicating that the application site and its setting are particularly valued locally.”* Both the population of the village and the many others who use public footpaths through the site would beg to differ.

8.2. A good proportion of both the development site and the SANG is safeguarded under the Hampshire County Council Minerals and Waste Plan in the MWCA Soft Sand category. The NPPF Sect 13 para 114 states: *“When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should: give great weight to the benefits of the mineral extraction; not normally permit other development proposals in mineral safeguarding areas where they might constrain potential future use for these purposes.”*

8.3. The Hart Council’s Landscape Capacity Study 2016 recorded that the site had a Visual Sensitivity Score of MEDIUM/HIGH for all three assessment criteria.

9. ENVIRONMENT

- 9.1. There are significant doubts about the lack of depth in the environmental survey for which the on-site element was conducted during January 2016, a time of year when many of the affected species would not be at their most prominent, to put it mildly.
- 9.2. By opening up the whole of Cross Farm to public access, existing populations of ground nesting birds and rare species of flora would be significantly degraded.
- 9.3. Local records indicate that wildlife displaced from local SANGs, particularly from Edenbrook, has been increasingly noted on Cross Farm. A combination of development area and public access to the SANG would further erode options for local habitats.
- 9.4. This potential further urban intrusion into the Upper Hart Valley would have a major detrimental effect on wildlife populations across the whole valley.

10. SANG and PUBLIC FOOTPATHS

- 10.1. SANGs are supposed to attract people away from the SPA. By urbanising the Northern half of both footpath 1 and footpath 5 across Cross Farm, the area will become significantly less attractive for the many existing users and hence have an effect counter to its main aim.
- 10.2. The southern section of the SANG is very boggy in wet weather and usually throughout the winter months and is therefore not a suitable area for walkers without significant and counter-productive groundworks including boardwalks.
- 10.3. There is an intermittent spring at the northern end of FP5 which results in a flow of water down FP5 towards Riverside Cottage rendering the surface both muddy and slippery and hence very unsuitable for an older population.
- 10.4. Access from FP5 onto the canal towpath is via a stile which is unsuitable for older people and would need to be removed to give adequate passage for older people.
- 10.5. Opening up access to the SANG area runs the risk of use by unwelcome motor cyclists, which has implications for law and order as well as damage to grounds.
- 10.6. Access to the proposed SANG car park on land within Zephon Common (Hampshire CL131) is of little merit.
 - 10.6.1. Egress from Zephon Common Lane onto Crondall Road is very dangerous, especially for casual users.
 - 10.6.2. Zephon Common Lane is mostly single track without passing places.
 - 10.6.3. Poulter's Bridge (a listed structure) has a pronounced hump which means that drivers are completely unsighted of pedestrian and other traffic until they crest that brow.

10.6.4. Zephon Common Lane is used by large tractors to gain access to farmland beyond Poulters Bridge.

10.6.5. Overall, this access is completely unacceptable from a road safety perspective as well as the potential for damage to verges.

10.6.6. The proposed SANG car park is on common land for which SofS permission would likely be required, permission which guidance suggests would not readily be given. Furthermore, due to its proximity to a popular area for fishing along the canal, it is likely that during the open season there would be significant use by anglers to the detriment of those who wish to access the SANG.

10.6.7. Overall, the proposed SANG car park is in an unacceptable location.

11. HOUSING NUMBERS

11.1. Figure 14.10 of the latest edition of the SHMA estimates a requirement for 164 extra care units for older people in Hart over the period 2014-2035, a target which would appear to have been exceeded already.

11.2. There is an acknowledged shortfall in provision of affordable housing in the area. The application states Class C2 for the nursing home, but is silent on the category of the many individual dwellings and apartments. Guidance suggests that such dwellings should be in Class C3, for which an affordable housing element is an admissible requirement.

11.3. Para 14.21 of the latest SHMA emphasises that the vast majority of older people will choose to remain in their own homes rather than move into specialist accommodation and states *“It is therefore likely that in future a greater proportion of older people will remain in their own homes, providing appropriate care can be put in place to enable them to stay. The type of accommodation needed for the ageing population is inherently tied to the approach to care and the extent to which care can be provided at home.”* The requirement for this care village in this location is therefore not clearly established given the current availability of non-nursing care locally for elderly people in their own homes.

12. SHLAA

12.1. The November 2016 edition of the Hart SHLAA includes SHL116 for Cross Farm with an assessment of potential housing capacity of only 80 versus the 224 proposed in this application. It calls for the setting and character of the nearby listed buildings and Conservation Area to be protected, which this application does not adequately address.

12.2. The SHLAA fails to note that Footpath1 bisects the site and records only Footpath 5 at the Eastern end.

13. REFUSAL

13.1. Crookham Village Parish Council strongly recommends refusal and believes that any appeal would fail given the strength and scope of the objections.

13.2. There are strong parallels with 14/03030/MAJOR at Hares Lane, which was refused by Hart and for which an appeal has been withdrawn. It is therefore suggested that the following adapted reasons for refusal, potentially augmented by further considerations, might be applied in this case:

13.2.1. The proposed development would constitute inappropriate development in this open countryside location, outside of the settlement boundaries of Crookham Village, and would have a significant detrimental effect on the linear character and setting of the conservation area by virtue of its siting, size and prominence in the landscape. The proposal site also lies within the local gap between Crookham Village and Church Crookham. As such, the development would be contrary to 'saved' policies GEN1, GEN3, CON22 and RUR2 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and to Government advice contained within paragraphs 17, 109 and 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).

13.2.2. The proposed development would result in substantial harm to heritage assets, comprising the Crookham Village Conservation Area and the 8 Grade II statutory listed buildings along The Street, which would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. As such, the development would be contrary to the requirements of 'saved' policy CON13 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and the advice contained in paragraphs 14, 17, 132 and 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).

13.2.3. The proposed development is for market extra care housing for which there is no requirement in the current version of the SHMA. In addition, the proposal does not make any provision for an appropriate level of on-site affordable extra care housing which is identified as a need in the SHMA. The development is therefore unsuitable in that it would neither provide a fully integrated community nor would it satisfy the need for affordable extra care housing as identified in the SHMA. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of 'saved' policies ALT GEN13 and ALT URB14 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and the advice contained in paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).

13.2.4. The proposed development would not make appropriate provision to mitigate the impact of the development on the provision of leisure facilities and local transport infrastructure. As such, the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 4.6.1 and the requirements of 'saved' policy T16 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006.

13.3. East Hampshire's refusal of application 55801/001 for a similar application on Grayshott is also relevant.

14. APPROVAL

- 14.1. Should Hart Council decide to approve this application, the following considerations also apply:
- 14.1.1. Crookham Village Parish Council will need to be included in s106 negotiations to ensure that local interests are adequately taken into account, especially with regard to shared use of on-site facilities.
 - 14.1.2. Severe restrictions will need to be placed on use of the main access:
 - 14.1.2.1. During silent hours due to the adverse effect on old listed properties bordering the entrance.
 - 14.1.2.2. During peak traffic hours due to the adverse effect on traffic flows and road safety of large vehicles manoeuvring in Crondall Road.
 - 14.1.3. An alternative car park for the SANG will need to be identified and considered.
 - 14.1.4. Improvement of the sections of both FP1 and FP5 between the site and The Street.
 - 14.1.5. Extension of the offered footway improvements along The Street to reach Malthouse Bridge so that both footpath egresses and also the walking route towards the distant bus stop are made suitable for the older population of the development.
 - 14.1.6. Conditions restricting occupancy to the approved demographic even if uptake fails to sell all the properties. Failure to accept this constraint would undermine some of the assumptions underpinning traffic assessments.