



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ODIHAM PARISH COUNCIL'S
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
HELD ONLINE VIA ZOOM ON
8 DECEMBER 2020 COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM**

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

In attendance: Andrea Mann (Clerk)

Also present: One member of the public.

P122/20 To receive and accept apologies for absence

Received from Cllr R Coleman and Hart DC J Kennett.

P123/20 To receive declarations of interests and requests for dispensation relating to any item on the agenda

Cllr Verdon declared a non-pecuniary interest in application number 164/20. It was agreed she would remain in the meeting but not take part in the discussions or vote.

P124/20 Chair's announcements

The Chair reported that Hart DC Planning Committee would be considering two applications on 9th December which OPC had previously objected to; for a single storey extension at Stoney Cottage and 16 dwellings with related items at Burford, West Street. The Chair had met Hart DC Kennett at the Burford site and agreed OPC's previous comments would be repeated to the Committee.

P125/20 To approve the following minutes:

18 November 2020 P110/20 – P121/20

The draft minutes of the previous meeting held on 18 November 2020 (P110/20-P121/20) 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).

P126/20 Public Session

None.

P127/20 Current planning applications

161/20 Reference: 20/02783/PRIOR

Address: Hambridge Ltd, Barley Row, 90 - 98 High Street, Odiham

Description: Notification of Prior Approval for the Change of Use from office

(Class B1(a) to residential (Class C3) at first floor to provide 1 two bedroom flat to include the creation of an internal entrance at ground floor

This application was received after the agenda for the previous meeting on 18th November was published. The response below was submitted under OPC's Scheme of Delegation and recorded by the Committee.



OPC Comments: OPC regrets the loss of office space and believes that the applicant should be required to market the property for office use to increase footfall of the High Street in Odiham.

162/20 Reference: 20/02682/FUL
Address: Swan Cottage, Hook Road, North Warnborough RG29 1EX
Description: Change of use of land to garden land and erection of outbuilding

Councillors agreed to suspend the meeting to allow the applicant to speak on this application.

OPC Comments: No objection.

163/20 Reference: 20/02605/HOU
Address: 10 Archery Fields, Odiham RG29 1AE
Description: Erection of a single storey side extension and erection of first floor extensions to both sides

OPC Comments: No objection.

164/20 Reference: 20/02784/FUL
Address: Waytes, 37 High Street, Odiham RG29 1LE
Description: Change of use of barn to a two bedroom dwelling including the erection of a single storey extension, detached garage and alterations to fenestration with associated hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments

Cllr Verdon, having declared a non-pecuniary interest at the start of the meeting, did not take part in the discussions of vote.

OPC Comments: Objection due to:

- The application being contrary to NP Policies 5 & 6.
- The proposals being an over-development of the site.
- Potential loss of trees in the future due to the proposed development being in close proximity to existing trees.
- The proposals being out of keeping to the street scene and conservation area setting.

165/20 Reference: HCC/2020/0536 (HR078)
Address: Calf Lane, Rye Common, Odiham RG29 1HU
Description: Proposed picking station and fines machinery at Calf Lane, Rye Common

OPC Comments: No objection.

P128/20 Previous planning application decisions
Decisions as listed on the Planning List were noted.



P129/20 Pre-Applications

Pre-application advice as listed on the Planning List was noted.

P130/20 Planning Appeals

Planning appeals as listed on the Planning List were noted. Further to the report previously circulated with the agenda, OPC had since received notification of an Appeal Decision for Cholsley House (Ref: APP/N1730/Y/20/3249501) which had been dismissed by the Inspector.

P131/20 Tree applications and decisions

Reference: 20/02802/TPO

Address: Roughs Cottage, Bartley Heath, North Warnborough RG29 1HD

Description: Cedar - trim back/cut back branches from the garage and the house by 2-3metres

OPC Comments: None.

Reference: 20/02919/CA

Address: Bartons Court, Dunleys Hill, Odiham RG29 1DP

Description: T1 - Hornbeam - Rear garden of no.13 - Crown reduction to previous pollarding points, 3.5m. 2 - G1 - Leylandi Cyprus (4no.) - side path of no.13 - remove vertical leaders to restrict height, prune front face and sides by 30cm to restrict lateral growth, ensuring that all cuts remain in the green to reduce risk of die back. 3 - T2 - Prunus (purple leaf) - fell to ground level and treat base to prevent re-growth.

OPC Comments: None.

Reference: 20/02956/CA

Address: 11 Farnham Road, Odiham RG29 1AA

Description: Refer to Planning List

OPC Comments: None.

Reference: 20/02931/CA

Address: 24 Angel Meadows, Odiham RG29 1AR

Description: Walnut (T1) - Reduce in height by no more than 0.5m back to suitable growth points. Reduce laterals by 1.5m - 2m into good growth points to create a natural crown shape as the tree has become very board and spreading over the Rd.

OPC Comments: None.

Tree decisions as listed on the Planning List were noted.



P132/20 To note that the application 20/01082/HCC Robert Mays School, West Street, Odiham Hook RG29 1NA re provisions of 2 sports pitches will be considered by the Regulatory Committee on Wednesday 16 December 2020

OPC Comment: Cllr Verdon's proposed response was accepted.

"Thank you notifying us about the meeting to discuss the above application on 16th December.

As already notified to your planning department in June 2020, Odiham Parish Council is very interested in being involved in the Community Use agreement and has an interest in commuted funds should any of the land be transferred to the Parish Council."

P133/20 To note correspondence sent to Ranil Jayawardena MP on the Planning Reform consultation

The letter as shown in Appendix 1 was noted.

P134/20 Planning correspondence

1. The Council had received several emails relating to a flyer circulated within the parish asking for views on restoration plans for the Deer Park. The flyer asked for feedback on outline proposals and, following discussion, it was agreed that OPC would not make comment or take any action at the current time. As a statutory consultee on planning applications, the correct process was for OPC to respond to planning applications, should any be submitted. Members further agreed that any application coming forward would be of sufficient community interest to warrant consideration by full Council.
2. Cllr McFarlane reported on email correspondence relating to an Upton Grey development which would connect 17 new homes to the main sewer, thus impacting on the capacity of the pumping station in North Warnborough. Hart DC explained that any new development had a legal right to connect to the main sewer and water utility companies, such as Thames Water, have a legal obligation under Section 94 of the Water Industries Act 1991 (WIA 1991) to provide developers with the right to connect to a public sewer regardless of capacity issues.
3. Following email correspondence from a resident, the developer of the Jolly Miller site had informed OPC their original plans to reinstate a path from Hook Road to the canal path, in order to facilitate access to the canal, was on hold because an application for the adjacent site was subsequently withdrawn and the landowners had closed-off the route. It was believed that a new application no longer provided for the link and, should this be approved, the Jolly Miller developer could see no way of re-establishing the route. The developer also included a paragraph concerning using their access road as an access road for the northern part of the new development and it was agreed to send this paragraph to the case officer.
Cllr McFarlane took no part in this discussion.



4. OPC had been notified of a new Government planning consultation on permitted development rights. Details of the consultation had been forwarded to the consultation undertaking the new Conservation Area Character Appraisals seeking their views. The full consultation would be referred to the following meeting for consideration.

P135/20 To note the date of the next meeting:

The date of the next meeting was noted as Tuesday 5 January 2021 at 7.30pm

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.17pm.

Signed.....

Date.....



The Bridewell
The Bury
Odiham
Hampshire
RG29 1NB

Ranil Jayawardena MP
ranil.jayawardena.mp@parliament.uk

26th November 2020

Dear Ranil

Thank you for your letter of 26th October concerning the planning white paper, and for your full and detailed response. As you know the Parish Council has responded directly. I am sure a majority would share your vision of beautiful houses in tree lined streets and these are likely to be more popular by far than the low-quality brown field sites that continue to appear as commercial and industrial practices change and evolve.

We were pleased to read that the SOS has agreed to rethink the allocation algorithm in response to concerns from many MPs. However, we continue to have concerns that the changes proposed will not entirely fix the problems you elucidate or hasten your vision of architecturally excellent development. You refer to delays of up to five years to get planning permission. This is however only one bottleneck. There are enough planning permissions granted in Hart to meet the housing allocation need for some 20 years and nationally it is reported that there are some one million permissions pending development. If these were progressed, surely the national housing needs would be met? Should there not be some time limit imposed when permissions are granted, and disincentives to sit on sites already agreed? Currently all you have to do is break ground for permission to stand indefinitely. Would not the public and government's interests be better served if permission lapsed if sites were not completed within say 10 years, and where building was not underway in 5, the developer was liable for council tax on the planned housing?

It is the opinion of the Parish Council that unless such conditions are introduced, developers will continue to sit on planning permissions until they see fit to develop.

We are also concerned that the high standards of design and build quality you refer to in your letter should be sufficiently sensitive to local contexts. Clearly the aesthetics of urban and rural locations differ hugely. Ours is a country with many distinct local characteristics and whilst we do not wish to conserve that in aspic, neither would we want to see it erased by the building of standardised housing. Obviously, we also have particular concerns for local conservation areas and the delicate ecosystems recognised in our SSSIs. We hope the barrier for qualification for 'protection' will not be set too low.

On the point of infrastructure, we hope a new bill will address the challenge we have in Odiham, in common with many other rural villages/towns, where a number of small developments have added significantly to the load on everything from health care to drainage without any of them contributing to the associated costs. We will be interested to see whether the new national levy benefits local government at parish/town level or whether funds will be retained by principal authorities for infrastructure. Current arrangements are unsatisfactory in this regard in that the intention is not being implemented in our district. Your letter makes no mention of Hart DC not implementing CIL, which came into force nationally in 2010, the rules of which would see 25% of CIL coming to parish/towns with a

neighbourhood plan. It will be interesting to see whether parish/towns benefit to the same level under the new formula – and if this is put into practice. Currently we have significant local need, for example to expand the nursery provision at Leapfrogs (who lease the building from OPC) and no infrastructure funds on which we can call. We are also facing a similar 'black hole' in relation to the adoption of the public land at Hatchwood/Montford Place.

You describe a powerful vision of how things could and perhaps should work in terms of quality of outcome and transparency of process. I am not sure how you will balance the desire of constituents to have access to housing for their children with the argument that affordable homes have to be built in affordable places.

Whilst you have heard from many constituents who support the bill, there are many who do not as evidenced by the concerns of your parliamentary colleagues. We hope that in the ongoing debate you will take into consideration the points above.

Yours sincerely



Cllr Dr Angela McFarlane
Odiham Parish Council Chair