

These are the unadopted Crookham Village Parish Council Planning Committee Minutes of Thursday, 1 June 2017, held at 8pm in the Zebon Community Centre, Danvers Drive, Crookham.

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

In attendance approximately 24 residents. Cllr. Jackson welcomed everyone and introduced himself and other Members of the Parish Council. He advised that the last two agenda items had nothing new to debate and would therefore not be dealt with this evening.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs. Simon Ambler (at a Cabinet Meeting).

2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Cllr. Jackson had no announcements.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Not dealt with.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA AND DELEGATION OF DISPENSATION TO THE PROPER OFFICER

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.

5. CONSIDER CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

The Chairman reminded Members of the need to consider crime and disorder implications for any items this evening.

6. HART LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

(i) Overview

The Chairman said the plan is primarily to build houses and infrastructure. The numbers in the plan document are as shown on the screen and there are roughly still 5,000 to build if the plan becomes the final plan. He showed the various sites which are to the north with not a lot going on in the rural areas. The major fuss which had covered a new settlement at Winchfield has disappeared and Murrell Green site has been added into the plan. There is a high-pressure gas main going through the middle of the site and this may impact the build. He then showed the Church Crookham area which deals with the Fleet Town Centre plan. Crookham Village is at the bottom and shows Cross Farm and its SANG area. At the bottom is a blue area which is supposed to be an industrial site but has an application in for 44 flats. The dotted area at the bottom is the approved Watery Lane development (won on Appeal).

Cross Farm site was down for 100 properties in the SHLAA but the draft Plan now suggests a 160-unit care village and 64-unit care home. It is not clear how many of these count towards the Hart housing total. We are discussing how cross Farm fits in with the policies in the draft plan NOT whether we like it or not. What Hart have done is lift a planning application and put it into the plan and any defects in that application have not been dealt with and in principle if Hart were to put it in as a site for a care home it would be less contentious than the deemed planning application. He then went into detail with how the Council had responded to the actual planning application and he hopes Members will support his reasons for putting that argument forward again.

Cllr. Jackson said it is important that residents raise their concerns about whatever issues concern them.

Hartland Village – was to be an industrial site but now put forward for housing and likely to be a bigger challenge in terms of potential land contamination of the site. Murrell Green he has mentioned. Cross Farm he suspects is just to fill a gap for nursing care and then there is Sun Farm. He then dealt

with Policy SC3 (Cross Farm) and pointed out the issues in relation to the SANG. Again, Hart have picked the policies out of the planning application in relation to flooding and sustainable drainage.

Policy SC10 – the settlement boundaries are known at present but if Hart decide to change them this is not an argument against the plan. He cited (c) no investigation has taken place in relation to this requirement.

Special accommodation – Hart do not have a way to categorise or count bed spaces and therefore do not know how many beds have already been provided and what remains as need. Hart have agreed to analyse the numbers but so far have failed to provide answers. If you have a development like Cross Farm with a warden on site then this is residential care – individuals with their own front door count for housing numbers for Hart and residential care figures as well. He has suspicion that this figure may have been reached now and will be asking Hart to provide the figures as this Plan is for up to 2032. The SHMA suggests that new accommodation numbers required for the elderly are imprecise because a proportion now elect to take care in their own homes.

Rural Exception Sites are covered in this Plan so we still have an option within the parish to fulfill a need (HARAH evidenced a need for 20 dwellings).

“In perpetuity”, according to one paragraph in the plan, only equates to 80years.

The Plan refers to a separate Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which is part of the viability of the Plan, but which has yet to be produced, so it is worth asking at what point will the public be consulted when Hart reach a conclusion on the needed infrastructure.

He explained how affordable housing works and how it is financed by the market housing and it is a challenge. Lots of little developments can stretch the local infrastructure because under current CIL rules one can only take funds from a total of 5 of these small developments for any one project. In relation to some infrastructure offered – schools for instance – it is out of Hart’s hands as to whether or not HCC will take up such sites and provide or not. So, delivery of an infrastructure plan is out of Hart’s control.

There is a suggestion that parking provision can be offset against alternative travel modes, which has proved unsuccessful and problematical on existing estates where insufficient parking spaces were provided.

Local gaps in this plan have yet to be defined and residents may wish to comment.

There are a whole host of different policies to use if you wish to comment on Cross Farm – the last page of the document is a list of the policies and what they cover. Residents might wish to relate to what is proposed for Cross Farm and if Members support it he will put this document on the website. There was no dissent from those Members present.

He then threw open the meeting to the floor.

(ii) Public participation (3 min max per person)

Tony Gower-Jones spoke and advised that a leaflet had gone through all doors expressing the concerns of FACE-IT. He spoke at length about the capability of Murrell Green coming to fruition during the plan period – and asked “is it the right place to put a new settlement”. FACE-IT are putting together a document which they will submit (they are on version 5 at the moment). He stressed how important it was that everyone should comment on the Plan as Hart have to take all views into consideration. Tina Collins asked how much we would get in S106 if Cross Farm goes ahead. Cllr. Jackson said it was not known but he said there is a need for the 40% affordable element on the site. In addition, elderly residents are likely to be far more active than in the past. Cllr. Jackson said if Hart introduce CIL then the Council get 25% if we have a Neighbourhood Plan but without it only 15% - however developers usually endeavour to plead poverty. S106 is a more constrained fund.

Mr. Boddy asked if the entry to Cross Farm was from The Street and Cllr. Jackson said both the draft Plan and the planning application specified access from Crondall Road beside Cross Farmhouse near the Crossways junction. He feels that there are many elements in the policies which legislate against this site. Tony Gower-Jones said if Cross Farm goes to the Planning Committee and gets passed then it is a done deal outside of the Plan. Sylvia Hebdon said there was a reference to the Grade 11 listed properties and these being conserved but at the same time there is a road running alongside these with the Cross Farm planning application. Cllr. Jackson said there was every reason to object to this on the Plan and you need to reiterate the points you raised against the planning application again in your response to the Plan. Tony Gower-Jones said FACE-IT had raised lots of issues and these were on its website.

Tony Gower-Jones requested residents to let him know if anyone wished to speak at the Inquiry into the Grove Farm application and FACE-IT would assist.

(iii) Councillor debate

Cllr. Jackson said he would raise points which he hoped Members would support in the Council response to the Consultation. He spoke about the housing numbers and the extra 2,000 buffer which is in the Plan and the adverse effect this would have on the calculations of the 5-year housing supply. He wishes to make this point to Hart. Cllr. Julia Ambler said that there was already a concern that the numbers for Watery Lane may not come forward in the 5-year supply. Cllr. Jackson said Hart have no control over delivery of build and it is two years since Albany Farm was granted permission. Cllr. Jackson said looking at the headline the Plan says it is to meet the needs of Hart residents and this is something which is clearly not the whole story when determining housing numbers. Objective 9 does not address current infrastructure shortfalls and needs to be addressed. The implication in the plan is that there is only one way to fund affordable housing and they do not look at other ways of funding outside of the original developer. Cllr. Julia Ambler said she believed the new administration at Hart would be likely to give consideration to other proposals.

Murrell Green has constraints as previously mentioned.

The developer at Winchfield has written to Hart saying he has all the land ready to deliver and it can come on line quicker than Murrell Green. Members suggested that land available at Winchfield would provide a more suitable site for a Care home as it is more sustainable. Winchfield has a short platform at the station and would need a longer platform and larger car park. However, there are issues which Network Rail would need to address to upgrade these shortfalls. Cllr. Jackson said safeguarding land for an extension to the station should be put forward.

Hartland Park – the proposal should include a better link than the current Kennels Lane towards M3 J4a.

Cross Farm – Hart’s “plant” of an unapproved application – the Local Plan should not be driven by a planning application and this is disgraceful, particularly as the evidence base does not support. There are two policies SE10C and NEC 2 with no evidence provided. Hart have lost the affordable elderly element from the previous SHMAA. Cllr Ambler said there are a large number of residents living in the area who cannot afford the market high prices. Cllr. Jackson suggested that Cross Farm could be put forward as a strategic SANG which would allow development elsewhere. Cllr. Kenaghan asked about Cross Farm and said he believed a number of the arguments against the planning application could be used. Cllr. Jackson said he proposed that we put in the comments in the covering letter and the comments about the Cross Farm planning application. Where it is important he will flag up the policies which can be used. He would like permission to put forward a “pruned” version of the Hart document which would be easier for Hart to understand.

Cllr. Ambler said there was an article which she had seen from CPRE in that the Plan does not make adequate provision in respect to the environment etc. Cllr. Jackson said many of the policies are aspirations without any evidence as to how to provide them. In relation to SUDS Hart mention there are better ways than this and invite consideration of these. There are some strange things in there. For Cross Farm Cllr. Kenaghan said the square meterage required of 0.5m deep suds is large and would mean a deep dig on one side as it is on a hill. Members supported Cllr. Jackson’s suggestion that the Council confirm that it believes it is very important that this Plan is enacted as soon as possible and that nothing this Council says is intended to delay.

(iv) Conclusions and recommendations

The Chairman advised that the Parish Council would agree its final response at the Monday meeting.

He reminded those present of the deadline date for responses.

- 7. Any new documents associated with 17/00264/REM (Albany Park) since last CVPC response.**
None.
- 8. Any new documents associated with 16/03400/OUT (Cross Farm) since last CVPC response.**
None.

Mr Brian Whyatt thanked the Parish Council for an informative meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.16.