



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ODIHAM PARISH COUNCIL'S
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
HELD ONLINE VIA ZOOM ON
16 SEPTEMBER COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM**

Present: Cllrs P Verdon (Chair), K Ball, A McFarlane and D Stewart.

In attendance: Andrea Mann, Parish Clerk

Also present: Hart DC K Crookes and one member of the public.

P72/20 To receive and accept apologies for absence
Received from Cllr R Coleman, Cllr MacPhee

P73/20 To receive declarations of interests and requests for dispensation relating to any item on the agenda
None.

P74/20 Chair's announcements
The Chair reported she had emailed M Jaggard at Hart DC regarding Montford Place public open space but had not received a response. The email had been forward to Hart DC Crookes who had offered to help to establish the commuted sum due to be paid by the developer.

P75/20 Approval of minutes
The draft minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 August 2020 (P57/20-P71/20) were agreed as a true record of the meeting to be signed by the Chair at a later date. (Proposed by Cllr Verdon, seconded by Cllr McFarlane, all in favour).

P76/20 Public Session
Mr Wilders read a statement on application 111and112/20 as the owner of the property. Mr Wilders explained the steps he had taken in drawing up plans to extend the property which were sensitive to the Grade II listed property and listened to concerns from neighbours.

P77/20 Current planning applications

Members agreed to consider application 111and112/20 first:

111/20 Reference: 20/01966/HOU
Address: Kings Cottage, Buryfields, Odiham RG29 1NE
Description: Erection of a single storey rear garden room (part retrospective).



OPC Comments: No objection, subject to the Conservation Officer checking the height of the proposed development and proximity with the neighbouring property.

112/20

Reference: 20/01967/LBC

Address: Kings Cottage, Buryfields, Odiham RG29 1NE

Description: Erection of a single storey rear garden room (part retrospective).

OPC Comments: No objection, subject to the Conservation Officer checking the height of the proposed development and proximity with the neighbouring property.

Councillors asked for an article to be included in the Autumn newsletter which encouraged residents to put their planning comments directly onto the Hart DC website rather than emailing them to the Planning department.

110/20

Reference: 20/01917/HOU

Address: Squirrels, Queens Road, North Warnborough RG29 1BB

Description: Erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and insertion of roof light to the front and one roof light to the side roof slope and the erection of one dormer to the rear to facilitate the conversion of loft to habitable accommodation

OPC Comments: Neutral. OPC requests a condition which requires the rear dormer windows, which overlook neighbouring property, to be opaque glass.

113/20

Reference: 20/01989/HOU

Address: 19 Reyntiens View, Odiham RG29 1AF

Description: Erection of a summerhouse in the front garden

OPC Comments: No objection.

41/20

Reference: 19/02257/OUT

Address: Land On The West Sides Of Alton Road, Odiham, Hook

Description: Erection of 60 bed care home and 30 dwellings (10 x 2 bed houses, 9 x 3 bed houses, 7 x 4+ bed houses and 4 x 2 bed flats) with associated parking and pedestrian and vehicular access

Comments due: 24 September 2020

OPC Comments: OPC objects to this application having concerns about the following points:

- i) Despite producing new plans the heights of both the care home and houses are still bulky and too high. We note the steepness of the roof slopes and their heights which for the care home is shown as over 10 metres and the houses at 8.5 metres.



Although the design and access statement specifies only 2 storeys, in the plans there are windows shown in the roof of the care home which indicates the possibility for a third storey.

Therefore, these plans do not meet the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) criteria in Policy 2 vii c and Policy 5 i and iii. The size and scale of the roofs are particularly noticeable on plots 17 to 20, 23 to 26 and 27 to 30.

We would request that permitted development rights for developing roof spaces into extra rooms are removed for all buildings within the site.

- ii) We note that it is now proposed to excavate the land at the site of the care home to reduce its bulk. We would request that extensive excavation of the site is carried out along the whole northern edge of the site to lower all the roof heights to minimise the appearance of the development to the existing settlements to the north of the site.
- iii) The market housing mix is more in accordance with the recently adopted Hart Local Plan however the size of the houses proposed has not changed. The new 3 bed roomed houses (plots 1, 7, 8 are exactly the same size as the previous 4 bed roomed houses (124 square metres). In addition the total square footage of all the properties together has increased from 3150 to 3168. The Plans now show 0 x 1 bed houses (1.26 in Local Plan), 14 x 2 bed (5.04 in Local Plan), 12 x 3 bed (7.9 in Local Plan) 0 bed (3.78 in Local Plan), 4 x 5 bed (0 in Local Plan).
- iv) The future ownership of the 0.25 ha of land needs to be considered. The site should be conveyed to OPC ownership, not a private management company, with a maintenance sum and a set number of years specified to allow it to be used for preschool use with the fallback to some other community use such as open space and public car park.

The space needs to be developed as a parking for pre-school staff and drop off area for parents. There also needs to be space for parking for users of the recreation ground which has the new teenage and junior facilities.

The parking area should not be where indicated on the Plan but should be sited after consultation with the Leapfrogs Nursery and the Parish Council. The remainder of the area should also be developed after consultation with the Parish Council.



114/20

Reference: 20/01993/HOU

Address: Mulberry Cottage, King Street, Odiham RG29 1NF

Description: Erection of a two storey rear extension, front porch, first floor front extension to form two gable ends, replacement of remaining dormer window with velux window to front roof slope and alterations to fenestration

OPC Comments: Neutral. The plans do not appear to meet the pre-application advice. OPC refers the decision to the Conservation Officer.

115/20

Reference: 20/02105/HOU

Address: Snatchangers Farm, Long Lane, Odiham RG29 1JH

Description: Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a detached outbuilding.

OPC Comments: No objection.

P78/20

Pre-Applications and decisions

These were noted as presented with the agenda.

P79/20

Planning Appeals

An appeal for the Alpaca Farm had been raised which would prevent the Enforcement Officer from taking any action until the result of the Appeal is known.

P80/20

Tree applications and decisions

Reference: 20/02070/CA

Address: Castle Bridge House, The Green, North Warnborough, RG29 1HQ

Description: Poplar – 50% reduction.

OPC Comments: No objection.

Tree decisions were noted.

P81/20

Consultation on Reform of the Planning Process

The HALC summary of the consultation of the Planning Process was noted and each consultation response was considered in turn:

- i) Changes to the current planning system – Cllr Verdon's draft response provided with the agenda was agreed in principle following revision to emphasise affordability and CIL - Cllr McFarlane agreed to provide this text following the meeting (Appendix 1).
- ii) Planning for the future – the draft responses to the consultation questions revised and agreed (Appendix 2).
- iii) Transparency and competition: a call for evidence on data on land control – Councillors resolved not to respond to this consultation as this was considered to be more relevant to principal planning authorities.



P82/20

Planning correspondence

- i) An email received from Mr Shepherd relating to the possibility of lorry parks across the UK was noted.
- ii) An email received from the developer of the Hook Road Neighbourhood Plan site included proposed plans was noted. There was no need to respond to this email and an application was expected in due course.
- iii) Cllr Verdon's email to Hart DC Mr Phillips notifying Hart DC of OPC's request for affordable at the Swan Pub development had been acknowledged.

P83/20

To note the date of the next meeting:

The date of the next meeting was noted as 6 October 2020 at 7.30pm.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.30pm.

Signed.....

Date.....

ODIHAM PARISH COUNCIL

COMMENTS ON WHITE PAPER – CHANGES TO THE CURRENT PLANNING SYSTEM

We are a Parish Council and statutory consultee to our local planning authority. Our Neighbourhood Plan housing mix policy and site selection was partly based upon housing need which was based upon local housing needs survey and public consultation so Neighbourhood Plans are a useful means of establishing housing need.

However, it should be recognised that whatever number is decided upon it may be that there is already enough land granted planning permission for that housing need to be met. Developers are holding back on building houses to maximise their profits. In our authority there is enough land granted permission for development to meet the 20 year housing supply need.

Developers should be required to build houses without delay on land where planning permission has been granted.

On the matter of affordable housing, we are concerned that the requirement to include a proportion of affordable housing would only apply on developments above 40 houses. In a rural area such as ours developments rarely achieve this size which would lead to no requirement for affordable housing which is in fact our greatest local need. To meet our local needs we would want to be able to increase the level of requirement for both rental and below market price housing.

We would also want to see contracts in place to ensure that these houses remain at a discounted value going forward otherwise this provision opens the possibility for quick profits on a re-sale.

We also have concerns relating to the infrastructure levy in situations where developments of new houses are distributed across a rural area in smaller numbers. Potentially none of these could attract levy yet the overall increase in houses will create a greater demand for all local services. We would like to see a provision for a calculation of levy that looked at the total impact of new build within a planning area such as a parish rather than simply looking at individual sites.

First homes: These are important but so are affordable rent units. What happens to first homes when the occupant wants to move on, are they only able to sell to other first time buyers?

Exception sites and rural exception sites: These should be encouraged in all cases.

Small sites threshold: Although we support the small, medium-sized developers we do not agree with raising the threshold of contributions to either 40 or 50 houses. In a small village where smaller developments are more appropriate there still needs to be a CIL contribution to the community.

Publicity arrangements for Permission in Principle: We agree that publicity arrangements should be extended for large developments.

ODIHAM PARISH COUNCIL

We are responding to your consultation on Planning Reforms. We are a Parish Council with a well supported Neighbourhood Plan which was made in 2017. Within the parish are 3 conservation areas and over 200 listed buildings. The Neighbourhood Plan has detailed specific design and development principles for both the conservation areas and allocated development sites. It also has a Policy detailing general design principles for the parish.

Before responding to your questions we would like to comment on some of your assumptions:

1.3 Planning decisions are discretionary rather than rules-based;

The NPPF contains the rules by which planning authorities make their decisions. They are not able to give consent against the NPPF.

It simply does not lead to enough homes being built;

Many planning applications are granted to developers but they are not starting and completing development of the much needed homes. In our district (Hart) enough applications have been granted to meet the 20 year supply of houses but developers hold back on building them. Our area is very expensive and even two bedroomed properties sell for over £300,000. Developers should be made to start building on land which has been granted planning permission within a short time scale e.g. 2 years and completed within 10. In high priced areas they should have to build a higher percentage of affordable market and affordable rental properties

Modernising day to day operation of the planning system:

Whilst we agree with the need for modern digital planning services there should still be a requirement that local notices are posted as most residents do not spend their time checking planning portals.

1.16 Strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions:

This is to be welcomed but should include sanctions on developers who have land banks and who will not build as they do not want supply to increase and prices fall.

Questions

Proposal 1

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

Time consuming, under-manned, complex

2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area?

Yes

As a Parish Council we are a statutory consultee for planning applications in our area
2(a). If no, why not?

3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future?

We are notified by Planning Authority.

For the public we suggest social media and local Newsletters as well as paper notices.

A dedicated national portal which allows searches by area and is not lost within a Planning Authority's own website would be an improvement.

4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area?

[Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas /

All of the above are important, top 3 would be:

- increasing numbers of affordable of housing
- protection of green spaces, environment and heritage
- more or better local infrastructure

5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals?

No: The three categories are too simple. Some areas designated as Renewal may be open to more development than would be sustainable and which would materially alter the whole ambiance of an area. There should be clearly understood specifications determined locally for sub-set categories.

Protected areas should also include areas designated as Local Green Spaces in Neighbourhood Plans and areas designated as Local Gaps in Local Plans.

We do not like the alternative options which would be too broad and not allow sufficient local input into design specifications.

Proposal 2

6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?

No.

It is important that local planning authorities and neighbourhood plans have a say in determining specific development standards as appropriate to their particular areas.

Proposal 3

7(a). Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of "sustainable development", which would include consideration of environmental impact?

Not relevant to us as a Parish Council

Each area is different

7(b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

They should be overseen by a third party body giving impartiality and objectional views without political ramifications.

Proposal 4

8(a). Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?

No.

It is not possible to standardise this as an inner city area which has affordability constraints and a country village also with affordability constraints cannot be treated in the same way. It is not the planning system which is preventing the building of houses, it is the developers not building on land already granted planning permission which they are not developing as they wait to maximise their profits.

8(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?

No. There are many other factors which need to be considered such as existing infrastructure, employment opportunities. A small village with expensive houses should not be expected to take a greater share of future development as without the infrastructure and employment in place this would lead to unsustainable development. Also smaller historic villages may lose their character and uniqueness.

The alternative option would be preferable.

Proposal 5

9(a). Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent?

Not sure. There must be sufficient detail in the outline application for it to be clear what is being proposed.

An area for substantial development may fall under the responsibility of different land managers and be subjected to applications from multiple developers. The approval process must allow time for the overall implications to be understood. A local authority and, more importantly, the planning authority itself may also be a partner in a hybrid regeneration project. In these cases a full, transparent, planning approval process is necessary.

Once outline is approved there should be faster route to detailed consent .

9(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas?

Not sure. Renewal areas can be very different in character and applications must be clear both on what is being proposed and the design. As various national design guides will not always be appropriate in different locations.

9(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?

Not sure

Proposal 6

10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?

Yes. However the digitalisation and software needed should not be prohibitive to individuals and very small developers.

Proposal 7

11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans?

Yes, however time should be allowed for updating, training etc.
The user should be able to access maps which are not just those included in the main Local Plan document, with zoom in and search features.

Proposal 8

12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?

No. This is not long enough for councils to be able to change the whole planning framework as they will still be carrying out their normal work.

Proposal 9

13(a). Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?

Yes, definitely. Neighbourhood Plans are the way that residents are able to have their say on the development of their locality. They are able to get involved, be consulted and feel that they are being listened to. Good Neighbourhood Plans are able to specify design principles that relate specifically to the character of their local areas and also identify suitable development sites that have the backing of the local community.

13(b). How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

More resources should be granted to help prepare Plans and online training and information could be made available.

Proposal 10

14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?

Yes, definitely. Large areas of land with planning consent are held by developers who want to maximize their profits. Sanctions should be considered if they do not develop the land within a stipulated time scale, e.g. 2 years to start the build and complete within 10 years.

Pillar Two

15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area?

Generally it is OK. However some developments are too densely built resulting in gardens that are too small and parking areas not able to cope with multi car families and visitors. The Neighbourhood Plan includes local design policies which makes it easier for poorly designed proposals to be rejected.

In areas subjected to special conditions, eg Listed Buildings or Conservation Areas, some developers plans appear to be sensitive and the developer keen to work with parishes before submitting applications.

16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area?

More green and open spaces and trees and more energy efficient buildings. Cars are very necessary as there is no public transport available. Importance of footpaths and cycleways.

The process needs to acknowledge that sustainable plans are dependent on different service providers and authorities. Sustainable should also mean realistic.

Proposal 11

17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?

Yes, if they have been formulated locally with community involvement to understand the character of each area.

Proposal 12

18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making?

No. A new body nationally should not be necessary but each authority could have a lead officer for design and place-making

Proposal 13

19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?

No comment

Proposal 14

20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty?

Yes, if sufficient support and resourcing is given to local authorities to implement it correctly.

Pillar Three

22. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?

- More affordable rental housing and affordable market housing.
- More or better infrastructure
- Green space
- Design

Proposal 19

23(a). Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?

Yes, however developers should have to start to pay a charge as soon as planning consent is granted, with the amount increasing if there is a delay in building to encourage development to take place.

23(b). Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally?

Locally as different parts of the country have different needs.

23(c). Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities?

More value as there is a great need for affordable housing and investment in local communities.

Areas of substantial development will need higher levies to provide adequate infrastructure to support a, sometimes significant, rise in population.

23(d). Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?

Not sure. A framework should be put in place to ensure that the borrowing can only be used to support infrastructure delivery.

24. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights?

Yes, if an office block becomes residential apartments then a Levy should be paid to support infrastructure demands due to the increase in population.

Proposal 21

25(a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present?

Yes – though we should be aiming to secure more affordable housing both rental and market.

25(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities?

No, affordable housing should be secured as well as the Infrastructure Levy as both are necessary.

25(c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk?

Not sure

25(d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality?

Not sure

Proposal 22

22. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?

Yes, however the neighbourhoods where the development is taking place should be able to say what is needed in their area through consultation with residents. Parishes should be a statutory consultee on local Infrastructure Delivery Plans.

26(a) If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed?

Not sure. Affordable housing should be a priority but not to the detriment of spending on necessary infrastructure.

Equality Impacts

27. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics.

No