

These are the unadopted Planning Committee Minutes of Crookham Village Parish Council of the Meeting held on 30 January 2017, at 8pm in the Zebon Community Centre, Danvers Drive, Crookham, GU52 0ZE.

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

In attendance: Hart Ward Cllr. Simon Ambler. There were 18 residents and 3 persons attending on behalf of the developer plus 3 latecomers.

The Chairman introduced himself and Members and explained how the meeting would be run. This was a meeting in public of the Planning Committee not a Public Meeting. He explained that this Planning Cttee was not the decision maker but consultees. Hart Council would make the final decision on the application. If individuals had views on this application, they must do so before 6 February. He then made a plea for people to consider joining the Parish Council to help share the workload. Currently the Council is 3 Members short.

1. Apologies for Absence

None.

2. Chairman's Announcements

None.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of 19 December were agreed and the Chairman advised he would sign these at the end of this meeting to save time.

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

None.

5. Consider Crime & Disorder Implications.

Members were reminded to consider these implications in coming to a recommendation this evening.

6. 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

• **Overview**

The Chairman advised the meeting that he would present the application at this point and when he had finished he would invite comments from the floor. He then went into detail about the application and spoke to the relevant slides to support his comments. Cllr. Eastwood was requested to address the environmental and archeologic aspects of the application and in addition Cllr. Eastwood also went on to the flood/ground water aspect and raised concerns about the landscape appraisal. The Chairman then invited comments from the floor.

Public participation

Mrs. Rebecca Smith, The Barne, Crondall Road. Her house is on the access lane to the site and major bedrooms would be looking onto what is currently a quiet lane. She would have to put up with lots of traffic and the family's quality of life will be damaged.

Mrs. Sylvia Hebdon, Chelsea Cottage, Crossways. She is concerned about the access these are grade 2 listed cottages with foundations which are not deep. There is the possibility of damage by the heavy plant needed for construction and ongoing possible damage with up to 200 car movements daily.

Mr. Peter Kernigan, Foxes Corner, Crondall Road. He has put a general objection on this already. His house is on the tributary to the river Hart and he is concerned about the route of the runoff water. Other than looking at impact on the gap if he was to argue for the developer, buildings too tall, routing of water, loss of amenity, traffic – the developer would say we have not done the detail yet. He wished the application could be blocked to tie the developer into providing more detail so people had something concrete to object to.

M/s Terry ten Kate, Brook House, Crondall Road. She endorses entirely the points Cllrs. Eastwood and Jackson have raised. Brooke House was not counted as one of the Grade properties which would be affected but she said the line of trees the where the buildings come out along the hill impacts on views from Brook House. Her garden is often underwater the land for the SANG is likely to be a wetland and under water most of the time. She is an ecologist and felt that surveys/data should be done perhaps in the spring. Building on what Mrs. Hebdon has said old houses do not have substantial foundations and even now her home quivers when large lorries pass by. She believes we are at tolerance level traffic wise.

Mr. Graham Holloway, here as an observer, he lives in Ash. He wished to refer to Cllr. Eastwood and concurred with many of his points. He wondered whether or not the land comes under the SPA area – he knows that Rushmoor, Waverley and Camberley have SPA for the Heathland. Cllr. Jackson said the SPA offset is the SANG ground area offered with this application.

Mrs. Norma Burton, Zephon House, The Street. She is at one end of f/p 5 and she is against the whole thing because with the number of properties suggested it will double the village and will be referred to as the place where the old people live. With 160 residents in the Nursing Home and there are over 200 properties in the village with old people and it is not going to encourage young people to move into the village.

Mr. Chris Thornhill, Meadow View, Crondall Road. Mr. Thornhill asked the question are there any other applications in the pipeline for which we can say we have taken our share. The Chairman advised no – other applications do not count.

Mr. Duncan McIndoe, 1 Malthouse Cottages, The Street. He was concerned about the cumulative effect of the traffic. He referred to an accident in The Street last year. He believed there was a duty of care but was advised that it is a sad fact that if you go back 15 years each application appears to have a small impact but collectively have added to the total.

Mr. William Richmond, Pinetops, The Street. The development backs straight onto his garden. What are these residents going to do because if they are infirm they are not likely to get along The Street to our one shop? He did not feel that upgrading the footpaths at taxpayers' expense should be allowed. They will have to get into a car and he is pleased that vehicles do park on The Street because they do slow the traffic down. The Chairman advised that the upgrade of the pavement has been offered by the developer by S106 agreement.

Representatives of the Planning Agent and the Operator.

Mr. Graham Bell spoke. He said he had listened to all that had been said – he referred to all the documents presented to the Council which all comply with requirements. He referred to the Public Exhibition which they had done last year when they had believed the Local Plan would come on board and which would coincide with the timing of this application. He believes that Hart will have to address the aging population in its Local Plan. He referred to a similar application at Hartley Wintney which had failed because it could not deliver the SANG. He explained that the cottages will house people around 72 to 74 and they will probably move into the Care home when the need arises. The Care home is for those who are in need of nursing and these people are not out and about at that point in time. With this facility, you stay where you are making friends and being part of a community. There is a highway consultant present who has done all his surveys but which no one ever believes. He referred to the Canal and water runoff and advised that the first

thing the Canal Authority ask is can you feed into the Canal. He referred to f/p 1 and the problems suffered with water coming down from the field and then flooding onto the Street – they can fix this.

The operator (Mr. Ben Gain) wished to deal with comments referring to the listed cottages they are moving the access further away from them – the design will enhance their view. None of what he has heard tonight surprises him. The surveys are what they are and have been done to expected standards. Speed of traffic – Highways have advised that there is nothing wrong with the junction and he had listened at the exhibition last year about residents' concerns regarding safety. As a consequence, the Highway officer had put forward improvements which would slow down some traffic. State of footpath – this is not a Geriatric Butlins holiday camp – he lives in a retirement village which has lots of activities and some of the residents are still working and there is a real community feeling between the village and the local population. All the activities on site can be embraced by residents of Crookham Village. There is a practice nurse on site and arrangements with local doctors which frees up surgeries. There are a lot of advantages and he can say now in the Planning White Paper the Secretary of is going mandate communities to produce policies for housing the elderly in their neighbourhoods.

- **Councillor Debate**

The Chairman invited Members for their comments under the following headings:

The Gap

Cllr. Julia Ambler said the gap at the top of the development concerned her and its coalescence with Zebon Copse estate. Cllr. Dr Sinka supported this view and said she would wish to maintain the separate identity. Cllr Jackson said the gap was to protect the village and conservation area he believed the setting would be seriously challenged by parking what is a little town on its doorstep. He believes we should object that the Gap has been completely closed. Members supported these comments.

Conservation Area

The Chairman said the Conservation area relies on views and the settings of listed buildings and the northern and western areas of the site have listed buildings abutting them. The heritage nature of the village is recognized and parking modern design buildings into it would be out of keeping. Cllr. Julia Ambler said the topography was a concern because whilst some of the buildings are much higher than existing they are also raised up because of the height of the site. She believed that the other side of The Street will have sight of the development over the dwellings abutting it.

Cllr. Jackson said the village is very lightly lit at night and if you put a modern standard of street lighting behind it it will have detrimental effect on the village. Cllr. Dr. Sinka said one thing not covered is that within the village there are a mix of designs and styles and to impose upon it a development which would dominate in one style would be out of keeping and she is very worried about the lighting even if it is at bollard height. Cllr. Eastwood said he supported what the listed building owners had said in relation to damage to the foundations of these dwellings with the construction traffic as well as the ongoing additional traffic. Members supported these comments.

Access

Cllr. Ambler said she was not at all happy about the access and that this is not a particularly good junction. Cllr. Dr. Sinka said she was concerned about the impact of traffic on The Street and the speed of some of the traffic at peak times – getting to and from the local schools will prove more problematic. Cllr. Jackson said he would like to raise the conservation aspect at Crossways of the proposed removal of a mature oak by the roadside and the hedge in front of Cross Farm House. He would have thought that obstruction of the site line was not sufficient to justify removal of the oak.

Cllr. Eastwood said he would like the developer to reconsider the whole of the design. Members supported these comments.

Transport and Travel

Cllr. Jackson said he did not feel the arguments about walking and cycling credible and we should point this out strongly. There is no bus service. The use of the school bus is not credible. We will see people in cars. It is interesting to note that there are garages on site for residents' cars. We should point out the lack of sustainability due to lack of public transport. Cllr. Jackson also said there was a mismatch between the number of employees quoted in different parts of the application, eg.31 or 60-80, which would clearly affect traffic and parking calculations. Members supported these comments.

SANG

The Chairman said the bottom portion is very wet for a good part of the year, and towards The Street end of f/p5 there is an intermittent spring which starts up in wet weather resulting in water running down f/p 5 towards the Canal to make parts of f/p 5 almost impassable due to slippery mud. There is a significant water table issue. One must question the viability of this SANG to do its job properly since the nesting season will coincide with the wet periods. All in all, paths have to properly account for the weather and boardwalks will probably be required at the bottom. Cllr. Julia Ambler said she endorsed the comments about f/p 5 in that it does not have to be particularly wet weather to be impassable. The Chairman said the other issue is the car parking arrangements for the SANG – Zephon Common Lane is single track with no passing points and there is a blind hump over the single track listed Poulter's bridge. The exit from Zephon Common Lane onto Crondall Road is also dangerous. This is not a viable proposition. Due to the proximity of the proposed car park to the Canal it is also likely to be very attractive to anglers. If the car park does not go on the Common land the only other route to a SANG car park would be through the development site. Members supported these comments.

Other points

Cllr. Julia Ambler wished to point out that there are currently 13 premium level care home and 5 basic level care homes in the Hart District area with the bulk of them in Fleet and Church Crookham. There are also at least four other extra care sites including, the new development on Kings Road, one in Yateley, one on the Edenbrook extension of 50 flats and Keeble Court which is a recently opened extra care facility on the Redfields estate which currently has properties for sale. There are also a further 24 sheltered housing developments within the HDC area. The greater number of such facilities for older residents in Hart may explain the demographics which shows a higher number of elderly residents in Hart District than in other areas.

Cllr. Jackson said that he reads the recent SMHAA to suggest that there is only a need for an additional 100 units of care across the whole of the SMHA area out to 2032. From observation of care complexes elsewhere, the initial population tends not to move away and gets steadily older and more withdrawn from the local community, which would have a seriously detrimental effect on the village as a whole in the longer term. He said constraints of eligibility should be enforceable. Members supported these comments.

Cllr. Julia Ambler also wished to object to the alteration of f/p 1 and was advised that this could/would be raised at a later stage.

The Chairman then advised the meeting that regardless of the view of this Committee the application would go forward to Hart and it was therefore necessary for the Parish Council to engage with the Planners at Hart for any S106 arrangements to mitigate the impact of the development on the community.

• Conclusions and decision

The Chairman believed that from what Members had said that they did not support this application. There was no dissent.

RESOLVED: The Recommendation for this application be deferred to the Council meeting of 6 February 2017.

The meeting closed at 9.33 pm.