



## Parish Council

admin@crookhamvillage.org.uk

These are the unadopted Minutes of a Planning Committee Meeting of Crookham Village Parish Council, held at the Zebon Copse Centre, Danvers Drive, following the Finance meeting, on Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> September 2018. Please refer to the Parish Council Minutes of the next meeting for any alterations.

**Present:** Cllr David Jackson (Chairman)  
Cllr Julia Ambler  
Cllr Peter Kenaghan  
Cllr Clive Eastwood  
Mrs Angela Sayers  
Mrs Carol Leversha

**Public:** Residents of the parish present.

**1. Apologies for Absence.**

Cllr Simon Ambler, Cllr Nick Hill and Cllr. Dan Bunter.

**2. Chairman's Announcements**

None.

**3. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The Planning minutes from the meeting in July 2018 were agreed and signed.

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

None.

**5. 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.

**6. Planning Application 18/01378/HOU**

Proposal: proposed entrance gates

at Pilcot Hill, Pilcot Road, Crookham Village, Fleet, GU51 5SP

The Chairman presented the application and invited Members views.

**RESOLVED: No objections.**

**7. Planning Application 18/01775/FUL**

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear kitchen extension

at Spice Merchant, The Street, Crookham Village, Fleet, Hampshire GU51 5SJ

The Chairman presented the application and invited Members views.

**RESOLVED: No objections.**

**8. Planning Application 18/01793/REM**

Proposal: Phase 1 reserved matters application for approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the community building, parking, NEAP and attenuation area.

at: Land North Of Netherhouse Copse, Hitches Lane, Fleet, Hampshire,

The Chairman presented the application and invited Members views. There was lengthy and informed debate on what was presented and it was resolved to respond as follows:

**RESOLVED: CVPC offers the following observations:**

**S106**

CVPC notes the very disappointing terms of Schedule 7 of the S106 agreement signed with Hart, to which the parish is not a party. The choice seems to be for Hart Council to accept what is on offer, regardless of its inadequacies, or instead get an inadequate sum of money which would likely result in an even-less-acceptable facility.

CVPC therefore feels unable to recommend refusal, but wishes to highlight the following questions about the current application in the hope that there will be agreement to allow refinement of the proposals before the application is determined.

## **Community Centre Building**

Our understanding of the role of communal buildings is to foster community spirit through provision of meeting facilities for playgroups and 'mothers and toddlers' groups with areas where younger children can safely play under supervision, as well as providing for a range of adult activities. Based on our experience with hosting such groups at Zebon Copse Centre, we ask:

- Given that this is an all-year facility, what heating provisions are included?
- The drawing indicates two halls apparently separated by a folding screen. What sound attenuation is proposed to give adequate sound separation between the two halls? This issue arose some years ago at Zebon Copse Centre and a 48db partition plus a roof-space sound barrier has proved just adequate.
- What acoustic treatment is proposed to manage sound quality within the halls (acoustic roof tiles, etc)?
- What is the proposed ceiling height? Low ceilings would likely appear claustrophobic to some users.
- What curtain/blinds are proposed for the windows? At Zebon Copse Centre we have been advised by child safeguarding advisors to include the ability for groups to shelter and not be seen from outside. The need to reduce external ambient lighting for screened presentations is also a normal requirement.
- What kitchen equipment is to be provided? From the plans we can identify only a sink.
- Is it acceptable that the meeting room lacks an alternative escape route for use in the case of fire?
- Is the entrance lobby, which is both narrow and small, large enough to prevent congestion at busy changeover times, including with buggies/pushchairs, and especially during inclement weather?
- Only two toilets seems rather inadequate, particularly when both halls are fully utilised. In addition, given that groups catering for very young children will likely be major users, does the proposed provision of toilets provide adequate safeguarding separation from other parallel users?
- What space is proposed for storage of chairs and tables, which are essential in a community centre but not required by all users? Playgroups also need significant storage; for example, the full-height playgroup store at Zebon Copse Centre measures 5.6mx2.5m and is very full.
- What security features are proposed?
- Can an office be included? Again based on experience at Zebon Copse Centre, we suggest that the inclusion of a secure office with adequate communications would be essential for administration of the facility.
- Is it considered that the design on offer, or the S106 cash alternative, has the potential to provide a financially-viable community building both initially and in the longer term?

## **Community Centre Parking**

Up to 50 parking spaces are specified by the S106, but only 25 are offered. The 56 spaces at Zebon Copse Centre with two similarly-sized halls are only just sufficient when both halls are in use, so 25 for this building seems quite inadequate. There appears to be space to continue the parking area round the northern side of the building to mirror the southern end. Could more parking be provided? If not, consideration needs to be given to the likely effects of overspill parking.

Use of the car park during the hours of darkness will require that area to be lit. What external lighting is proposed?

Proximity of the community centre parking to properties with inconveniently-convoluted road access to designated parking seems likely to encourage resident parking on the community centre car park. What measures are proposed to minimise this risk?

## **Community Centre Open Space**

What play equipment is to be provided?

It is likely that play groups will be major users of the proposed formal play area. The proposed location distant from the building would inhibit both adult supervision of play and also easy access to toilet and other facilities within the building. Could the children's play area be relocated to be adjacent to the building within a fenced area to enhance safeguarding?

The proposed split of the open space into two sections again challenges supervision by staff at the centre from both safeguarding and law and order perspectives. Could the layout be altered to allow better views from the centre over the whole length of the field, perhaps by moving the proposed 'play woodland' to the far end of the field and, ideally, with a more-natural planting?

Would it be more appropriate to reduce the use of non-native species in the planting scheme?

## **Pond**

It is not clear whether the pond adjacent to the centre is anticipated to be wet most of the time or to act purely as a balancing pond and be dry most of the time.

Could the shape of the pond be made less obviously artificial by modifying the long straight edge?

Has provision been made for a wildlife corridor between the pond and adjacent vegetation corridors, including the northern boundary of the community centre field where a native mixed hawthorn hedge would be appropriate?

#### **Ancient Woodland**

Could the small ancient semi-natural woodland at the north west corner of the site be managed as a dog-free refuge by coppicing and selective tree removal to restore the bluebell carpet and other fragile flora?

#### **Linkage to SANG**

It is not clear whether a natural route from the development to the SANG would traverse the community centre plot. Clarification of anticipated routes between the development and SANG would be helpful.

#### **Consultations**

Although the developer held early pre-application meetings with the parish council before submitting the outline application, we see little sign that parish inputs made any significant difference. It is regrettable that there was no consultation with the parish in advance of submitting reserved matters applications, especially for the community facility.

CVPC would welcome the opportunity to assist in refining the layout and features to enhance the benefit of this facility to future residents of the development site.

### **9. Planning Application 18/01794/REM**

Proposal: Phase 1 reserved matters application for approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the proposed SANG.

at: Land North Of Netherhouse Copse, Hitches Lane, Fleet, Hampshire.

The Chairman presented the application and there was informed and lengthy debate and it was resolved to respond as follows:

#### **RESOLVED: Crookham Village Parish Council offers the following observations:**

The proposed SANG lies partially in the parish of Crookham Village and partially in the Fleet Town Council area. This CVPC response addresses issues across the whole site.

- It is not clear what routes are proposed for transit on foot between the main development site and the SANG on the other side of Hitches Lane, how such access will match natural walking routes within and from the development, and what measures will be put in place to minimize risks associated with crossing the busy Hitches Lane.
- The proposed walking route within the SANG is very convoluted and unlikely to correspond to preferred routes of users. It would be preferable to consider this SANG as an extension of the existing Edenbrook SANG with a more-natural, shorter, route within the extension feeding into a long-enough total route through the whole SANG area.
- Given that the SANG lies within the flood plain of the adjacent River Hart, there are serious doubts that the mown-grass paths would be sufficiently accessible in wet weather, reinforced by negative experience with the existing Edenbrook SANG. Consideration should be given to providing all-weather paths (possibly using compacted gravel) with appropriate consideration of requirements for those in wheelchairs, pushing buggies, and using mobility scooters.
- The ancient woodland includes valuable ground flora such as bluebells. Measures to minimize impact on these sections deserve detailed consideration.
- There is scope to enhance wetland habitats along the stream that crosses the SANG extension approximately N-S, which would also add value to users of the SANG. A linear mosaic of pools, ponds, wet fen, reed bed and scrub to the west of the north south ditch would deliver ecological and visual diversity to the new SANG and enhance a resilient wildlife network. This would also provide potential habitat for nightingale recolonisation, a targeted red-listed species in Hampshire and Hart following significant declines.
- Assuming that the combined SANG will be a contiguous area, the need for the secondary 12-space parking area should be carefully tested.
- There is concern that the proposed TRIM trail will detract from the natural countryside experience for SANG users; after all, SANGs are supposed to be Natural Green Space. Consideration should be given to relocating this facility to open space within the development.
- We strongly support the proposal to create a hay meadow, but question the likely success of the minimal technique proposed (over-seeding with vigorous couch grass) and suggest that a more-appropriate approach would involve herbicide application, cultivation and sowing. The area so treated could be increased significantly to ensure that this would be a resilient and stunning habitat of value to both pollinators and people.

- The new north-south 'fenced' boundary on the western edge of the southern SANG portion would be greatly improved if a low fence was incorporated into a hawthorn/blackthorn-dominated hedgerow with grey willow. This would provide important habitat connectivity and rapidly integrate the SANG into the surrounding countryside in a way a bare fence and a few trees would not.
- There is scope for revised planting to better screen the new Sports Centre and to use fewer forest-scale trees across the floodplain where the scrubby vegetation with open views is more appropriate.
- Consideration should be given to providing localized access to the River Hart and specifying measures to control Himalayan Balsam in this area.

## 10. Planning Application 18/01795/REM

Reserved matters application seeking the approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of 189 residential dwellings.

At: Land North Of Netherhouse Copse, Hitches Lane, Fleet, Hampshire.

**RESOLVED: Crookham Village Parish Council OBJECTS for the following reasons:**

### **Social Housing**

Whilst CVPC strongly supports the principle of early provision of social housing, there is serious concern that the proposed social housing is very largely separated from private dwellings, contrary to the established practice of mixing the types of housing to enhance community cohesion.

### **Approved Housing Total**

Contrary to the assertion in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the introduction on page 1 of the Design and Access statement, 16/10651/OUT, approved at appeal, was for **UP TO** 423 houses. There is therefore no compulsion to build the whole 423 if other factors dictate otherwise.

### **Over Development**

The glossy illustrations do not adequately show the multiplying effect of rising ground over this site on the visual perception of housing density. As proposed, this site would appear cramped and over-developed.

### **Housing Density**

Much of the proposed social housing is in large multi-storey blocks which seem very inappropriate in this rural setting.

The generously-spaced street scenes from the outline application reproduced on page 17 of the Design and Access Statement are in stark contrast to the higher, denser scenes for this application on pages 20, 24, 32, 38, 40 and 41. Had such dense street scenes been exposed at the outline stage it has to be questioned whether it would have influenced the decision process.

### **Hitches Lane Street Scene**

The present street scene along that section of Hitches Lane is dominated by roadside trees which helps to preserve the perceived separation of urban Fleet from rural Crookham Village and its conservation Area.

High density multi-storey blocks immediately adjacent to Hitches Lane would be particularly damaging to the street scene and result in excessively-reduced perception of a gap between Fleet and Crookham Village.

The image on page 38 of the Design and Access Statement is especially worrying since it suggests that the developer intends to open up vistas into the development from Hitches Lane, which is the roadway in the foreground of the picture. A second Edenbrook-style dominant frontage would be very unwelcome.

Tree screening from along Hitches Lane should be preserved and enhanced to reduce the urbanising visual effect on the highway gap to Crookham Village.

### **Highway Adoption**

No information is provided about which roadways are for adoption by Hampshire Highways.

### **Street Lighting**

Because this site covers rising ground which up to now has helped separate urban Fleet from rural Crookham Village, street and other lighting requires careful design to minimise light pollution and the visual impact of this urban sprawl on the adjacent Conservation Area.

Apart from general comments on page 61 of the Design and Access Statement, there seems to be no detail of street and other lighting on which judgements might be made about suitability and effect on visibility for Crookham Village Conservation Area.

### **Internal Road Layout**

Illustrated on page 58 of the Design and Access statement, some vehicle routes to and from designated parking spaces is via convoluted routes which will encourage those living in or visiting properties with easier access from other locations to park on major estate roads or the proposed community centre car park instead.

## Car Parking

The closest active bus stops are almost a mile walking distance from the nearest points on the development; plus a further distance from housing within the estate. The sustainability assessment does not reflect current provision of public transport.

Calculations of car ownership based on data across the whole district aggregates urban areas with more-remote areas lacking easy access to public transport. The result is seriously to underestimate the potential car ownership numbers for this rural site remote from public transport and retail facilities.

The proposed parking provision of only 402 spaces (Design and Access Statement p56) for 189 dwellings is woefully inadequate and would result in yet another estate plagued with excessive on-street parking and consequential issues with obstruction of traffic and pedestrians.

Based on data (see Fig 1 below) in Table 1 on page 11 of Hart's 2008 Interim Parking Strategy and the housing figures on page 28 of the Design and Access Statement, total parking required in Zone 3, for which this site qualifies, is 543.5 for cars plus 353 cycle spaces. The current proposal falls short even of Zone 1 (430.5) and Zone 2 (494) for cars and is clearly completely unrealistic.

<b>Hart Parking Standard 2008 page 11 table 1</b>				
	ZONE			
beds	1	2	3	Cycle
1	1.1	1.5	1.75	1
2	2.25	2.5	2.75	2
2	2.25	2.5	2.75	2
3	2.75	3.25	3.5	2
4+	3.25	3.5	4	2

  

<b>18/01795/REM Grove Farm Phase 1 D&amp;A p28</b>				
Beds	Type	PD	HA	Total
1	Appt	5	20	25
2	Appt	17	32	49
2	House	30	26	56
3	House	22	28	50
4+	House	7	2	9
		81	108	189

  

<b>Apply Hart Parking Standards</b>			
ZONE			
1	2	3	Cycle
27.5	37.5	43.75	25
110.25	122.5	134.75	98
126	140	154	112
137.5	162.5	175	100
29.25	31.5	36	18
<b>430.5</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>543.5</b>	<b>353</b>

**Fig 1: Parking calculations based on Hart Parking Standard 2008**

### Garages

Based on experience with existing estates on the periphery of Fleet, realistic parking requirements for this site, which has no ready access to public transport or retail facilities, will significantly exceed even Zone 3 provision. Consequently, CVPC recommends an overall condition to remove permitted development rights to convert garages and parking spaces for other uses as was applied to the Freeland Farm section of Zebon Copse estate.

It appears that the only properties to have garages are those for private ownership. Large areas of communal parking will require formal ongoing management rather than it being left to residents to negotiate between themselves for such matters as maintenance and general upkeep.

### Play for Flats

Careful consideration should be given to ensuring that there are suitable, overlooked, areas for children to play immediately adjacent to the blocks of flats rather than relying only on more distant play areas.

### Communications

There is no mention of fibre or other broadband connectivity in the Design and Access Statement. Fibre or cable connections are essential in today's world both to housing, including individual apartments, and to the community centre.

### Removal of Hilltop

It had been suggested earlier that the height of The Tump (the hill in the development site) would be reduced in an attempt to reduce visual intrusion into the wider panorama. No details have been included in this application.

**11. Availability for the next planning meeting.**

Meeting dates for 2018

2018	CVPC Meeting		FC/ Planning	
October	Monday	1st	Monday	15 <sup>th</sup>
November	Monday	5th	Monday	19 <sup>th</sup>
December	Monday	3rd	Monday	17 <sup>th</sup>

The meeting closed at 10.05pm