

CRONDALL PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF MEETING

Held on Monday 18th January 2016 in Crondall Church Rooms

PRESENT: Cllr C Dorn – Chairman
Cllrs D Argent, C Bryant, R Ellerington, I Fortune, E Groslin,
C Hebborn, N Lambert

APOLOGIES: Cllr K Crookes, Hart District Council

IN ATTENDANCE: Cllr S Gorys - Hart District Council
Cllr J Glenn - HCC
Mrs M Harris - Parish Clerk

There were 16 members of the public in attendance

The meeting commenced at 7.34pm and ended at 9.47pm

01/16 Declarations of Interest

On receiving a written request the Clerk had previously notified councillors that under the powers granted her as Proper Officer under the Localism Act 2011, Section 31 (4) c, she had offered a Dispensation to all councillors to enable them to discuss and vote on agenda item 8, the Planning Application for Old Parsonage Meadow, Croft Lane. The Dispensation would run until the end of the Councillors' term of office in May 2016.

Cllr Lambert shared advice from Hart DC's assistant monitoring officer (received on Friday 15th Jan) suggesting that councillors with properties close to the site should not participate, however the advice also pointed out that it was not against the law for them to take part. As Cllr Lambert had failed to share this advice in advance (before the meeting), with his fellow councillors, or with the Clerk, there had been no opportunity to test these views. The Clerk remained of the opinion that her interpretation of the Act was correct, based on her professional knowledge and published advice from Hart. Councillor Lambert made it clear that he did not wish to be covered by this Dispensation and would make any necessary declarations for himself. The Clerk **NOTED** his decision.

02/16 Minutes of 14th December 2015 meeting

The Minutes were proposed for acceptance as an accurate record by Cllr Argent, seconded by Cllr Bryant and **AGREED** unanimously. The Chairman signed the Minutes.

Matters arising from the 14th December 2015 meeting not covered by the agenda

03/16, 181/15 *SHLAA 159 letter*. The letter had been sent but no reply or acknowledgement had been received.

04/16, 182/15 *Old Parsonage Meadow letter*. The letter had been sent and an acknowledgment received. It was noted that during the past week some work had been undertaken to tidy the meadow.

05/16, 183/15 Village Shop. It was noted that a Village Shop Update Meeting was planned for Thursday 21st January, 8pm in the Village Hall where attendees would be updated on progress.

06/16, 184/15 Assets of Community Value. Councillors had been requested to send a list of their potential nominated properties and land to the Clerk; none had been received.

07/16 Announcements from the Chairman, Clerk, and Members questions received in advance.

The Chairman wished to modify the agenda to include a discussion on a proposed letter to Hart DC, commenting on their decision to stop the current Housing Consultation process on the Thursday after the Agenda was issued. A draft letter had been circulated to councillors for consideration. Cllr Hebbron felt that Council should have longer to consider this matter, however after a brief explanation of the background to the proposal Cllr Dorn proposed an additional Agenda item be added. This was seconded by Cllr Fortune and **AGREED** (In Favour 7:1 Against).

The Chairman reminded those present that this was a 'meeting in Public' and not a 'Public Meeting'. Those who had registered would be invited to speak at the appropriate time. There were no announcements from the Clerk and no Members Questions.

08/16 Representations by the Public

There were no representations.

09/16 County and District Councillors' Report

Cllr Gorys was questioned on the decision to stop the Hart Housing Consultation. He stated that he was unable to add anything to the information regarding the stopping of the Housing Consultation beyond that which was on Hart DC's website. He understood the Consultation was likely to be re-run with minor changes from the end of January / beginning of February. He confirmed that those original respondents who had given an e-mail contact would be contacted and that every household would be leafleted, with respondents asked to resubmit their responses in the light of the revised information.

Cllr Lambert asked whether there had been any resignations yet. Cllr Gorys advised that he was not aware of any. In response to a question Cllr Gorys advised that the decision to 'stop' was an internal decision and not the result of outside pressure. A member of staff had inadvertently uploaded incorrect/out of date information to the website which had compounded an earlier error of omission of some data from the original consultation document. CPC indicated that it wished to be reassured that there was proper 'version control' going forward, with verification of responses to ensure that the final results are sensible. Cllr Gorys responded that this was all under discussion but that he had not yet had the opportunity to talk to officers.

A number of councillors wished to know what would happen to the very many responses already made. Cllr Gorys stated that these would be taken into account; however it was pointed out to him that this was not the interpretation made from the Q&A provided. Cllr Argent stressed that the likelihood of anyone wanting to submit duplicate or bogus responses was negligible and that in order to regain public confidence people deserved to have confidence that their already expressed views would be given due weight. Cllr Gorys acknowledged that the point was well made.

Cllr Hebbbron expressed concern that the whole Local Plan might be jeopardised and that Hart could not afford for its plan to be rejected again. Cllr Gorys accepted this and stressed that Hart had now been employed a respected and experienced planning Inspector to assist them. Additionally he felt that as this was an 'informal' consultation and not a statutory one 'judicial review' was highly unlikely.

10/16 Planning applications

Council considered the planning report supplied in advance by Cllr Lambert.

5/02989/FUL	Land North of Croft Lane Crondall, GU10 5QG	Residential development of 14 dwellings comprising 5 affordable homes and 9 market price homes, garages and parking spaces, access road, green space, landscaping and roadside layby
-------------	--	--

Cllr Lambert took Council through the main points of the application and made reference to the statutory consultee comments received to date. Cllr Lambert reported that so far Hart had received 130 objections from members of the public and a further 21 supportive or neutral comments. It was further reported that the Developer's planning consultants had sent some additional information to Council, which had been circulated.

Mrs O'Connor spoke on behalf of the Crondall Conservation Action Group. They are opposed to the application on four grounds - Conservation, Design, Infrastructure and Planning. She gave evidence under each heading.

Cllr Lambert commented that 'beauty was in the eye of the beholder' and he felt the application strove to preserve the 'look' of the site, there were also large gaps between the properties to avoid overlooking. Traffic outside the school was already a problem and the proposed development was unlikely to affect this, or the other traffic problems in Crondall.

Cllr Argent expressed a significant concern regarding the management of the 'open space' and the 'no-development clause'. He believed these needed to be resolved before any application could be considered. The Land Registry indicates that the site appears to be owned by three separate entities, one of them owning roughly the area designated as the 'wild flower meadow'. Cllr Lambert reminded Council that the would-be developers had suggested that this land might be given to the Parish Council. Cllrs Errington and Hebbbron commented further on the lack of clarity regarding the use and maintenance of the proposed 'open space'.

Cllr Groslin stated that the OPM working party requested that any scheme respected the surrounding buildings, particularly in regard to scale, and maximised open space and social housing for the village. However, the scheme seems excessively high, the open space is in fact a smaller area than in previous schemes and a financial contribution is being suggested to make up any short fall in affordable housing, rather than additional housing.

Cllr Dorn pointed out that Hart often state that any Conservation Area is as *such* and not a 'Preservation Area' nevertheless the proposal does not enhance the Conservation Area.

Cllr Hebbbron expressed his disappointment that the developer was not present to answer questions. He felt that the site was already a flower meadow and that building on it could hardly improve the ecology of this natural open space.

Cllr Bryant believed the development 'would stick out like a sore thumb'.

Cllr Hebbroon commented that the developers were deluding themselves if they believed that surface water would run away naturally and not cause flooding. Cllr Lambert pointed out that information had been supplied detailing the applicant's approach to managing waste and surface water from the site.

Cllr Ellerington mentioned the Conservation Area document and its conditions while Cllr Fortune stressed that the development of this site would reduce the ability to trace the origins of the village.

In the absence of any suggested comments in Cllr Lambert's Planning Report Cllr Groslin had circulated a list of comments for consideration, after further discussion of these and amendment to them Cllr Dorn proposed **OBJECTION**, this was seconded by Cllr Ellerington and **AGREED** (In Favour 5:1 Against, 2 Abstentions). The Council's detailed response to the Planning Application is appended as Annex 1.

15/03091/PREAPP	Broden Stables Redlands Lane Crondall	Demolition of existing building, sand school and floodlighting and erection of 30 residential dwellings.
-----------------	--	--

Cllr Lambert took Council through this pre-application. Mr Robin Assael spoke against the proposal; he felt that more work was required in general on knowledge of land ownership within the Parish (e.g. on 'ransom strips') and he volunteered to assist the Parish Council with work on this identification should they be interested. Cllr Lambert pointed out that all pre-applications are listed on the Hart DC website and that Council may only comment on the application before them, who owns the land is not a consideration. Public comments on applications are welcomed by Hart. Mr Assael was thanked for his contribution.

Following discussion which included concerns regarding the capacity of the village sewage pumping facility and the likelihood of flooding problems due to excess surface water contributing to flooding in the area Cllr Lambert proposed the following **COMMENTS**:

The proposed development would be an undesirable expansion of development outside the settlement policy boundary of Crondall as defined in the Hart District Local Plan thereby resulting in an unwarranted growth of the village into the open countryside. It is not contiguous with the settlement boundary (the Crondall New Surgery [NCS] is technically in the countryside).

The site as suggested would create a serious highway impact on Redlands Lane.

The site would be visually intrusive and create serious additional surface water drainage problems in Redlands Lane.

There has been no prior engagement with the Parish Council.

The screened view from Pankridge St on p3 of the document is disingenuous as the site lies ~150m further up the road and around a bend. We stress that the road serving NCS narrows immediately after NCS.

3 storey buildings would dominate the skyline and ruin the setting of the village.

This was seconded by Cllr Hebbroon and **AGREED** unanimously

15/02873/LBC	The Brambles Church Street Crondall GU10 5QL	Internal alterations to enable the reversion to a single dwelling from multiple occupancy (3 Dwellings)
--------------	---	---

Cllr Lambert proposed **NO OBJECTION** subject to:

Construction method statement to show how the works are to be completed and how other works to the fabric are to be restored.

Construction method statement to show storage of equipment and keeping all construction vehicles on site.

Hart District Council Planning to keep a watching brief on all stages of the works.

This was seconded by Cllr Groslin and **AGREED** unanimously.

15/03015/HOU 15/02985/HOU	Greenacres, Dippenhall Street Crondall GU10 5PE	Double garage / Bike store Single storey rear extension and first floor side extension
----------------------------------	--	---

Cllr Lambert proposed **NO OBJECTION** this was seconded by Cllr Groslin and **AGREED** unanimously.

15/02999/FUL	Longlees Redlands Lane Crondall GU10 5AY	Relocation of stables, new horsewalker, LED floodlights on ménage (part retrospective)
--------------	---	--

Cllr Lambert proposed **OBJECTION** with the following comments:

Concern over the height of the lighting at 3.2m high in the countryside, should be replaced by low level lighting. No objection to the stable block

This was seconded by Cllr Groslin and **AGREED** unanimously.

15/02977/FUL	Clare Park Private Retirement Residences Ltd Clare Park GU10 5DT	Change of use of original General Managers Cottage to Residents Cottage. Extension of original General Managers Cottage to form additional cottage for residents. Construction of five new residents cottages.
--------------	---	--

Cllr Lambert proposed **NO OBJECTION** and supported the Applicant's comment that Clare Park consider that the proposed development and consequent increase in the resident population on site would not result in an adverse impact on the integrity of the SPA habitat.

This was seconded by Cllr Groslin and **AGREED** unanimously.

15/03060/FUL	Land to the east of Dares Farm, Dares Farm House Farnham Road, Ewshot GU10 5BB	Continued use of the land and buildings for Use Class B8 (Storage and Distribution) purposes and associated access, car parking and manoeuvring areas.
--------------	--	--

Cllr Lambert proposed **NO OBJECTION** this was seconded by Cllr Groslin and **AGREED** unanimously.

15/03109/HOU and 15/03110/LBC	1 Byrons Cottages Dippenhall Street Crondall GU10 5PE	Erection of a two storey extension and internal alterations. Amendments to 15/02298/HOU.
-------------------------------	---	--

Cllr Lambert proposed **OBJECTION** commenting that:

*The proposed two bedroom sky lights will cause overlooking of the neighbouring property.
No objections to the other listed amendments*

This was seconded by Cllr Groslin and **AGREED** unanimously.

15/02986/HOU	Maxwell Cottage Itchel Lane Crondall	Single and 2 storey extensions and loft conversion
--------------	--------------------------------------	--

Cllr Lambert proposed **NO OBJECTION** commenting on the quality of the scanned plans which were of poor quality and confusing.

This was seconded by Cllr Groslin and **AGREED** unanimously.

Cllr Lambert was thanked for his report and presentations.

11/16 Hart Consultation – Refined Options for Delivering New Homes

Cllr Dorn referred to three documents which had been circulated for comment / amendment in advance of the meeting. These were:

1. A detailed response to the Hart Housing Consultation
2. An Annex to the above, being the completed 'Questionnaire' supplied
3. A side letter expressing concerns regarding the abrupt stopping of the Consultation (reported under Minute 12/16).

Cllr Argent suggested that given the fact that the Consultation had been stopped that Annex A should be removed; additional comments in relation to the Gas and Oil pipelines at SHLAA 159 be added and the detailed response be sent. Cllr Dorn also suggested that any Questionnaire arising from the revised Consultation should be completed and sent on as appropriate. These suggestions were proposed for acceptance by Cllr Argent seconded by Cllr Hebborn and **AGREED** (in Favour 7:1 Against).

12/16 – Additional Agenda Item – letter to Hart DC re stopped Housing Consultation

The letter as circulated was displayed for councillors to review. Councillors were concerned to get over a number of points in particular the possibility of 'consultation fatigue'. It was suggested that as some revisions were proposed to the revised Consultation documentation that this might be an opportunity to correct the information regarding some SHLAA sites and also to add new ones. Cllr Hebborn felt that with so much of the information already out-of-date it was unrealistic to expect Hart to make changes at this stage. Cllr Argent believed that the essential message for the letter was to try to ensure that consultees' original comments are included in the final analysis.

Cllr Dorn proposed that the letter be sent straight away, this was seconded by Cllr Fortune and **AGREED** unanimously.

13/16 Budget and Precept request for 2016/17

The Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman had produced a draft budget which had been circulated in advance for councillors' comments. Cllr Lambert made a number of requests for potential expenditure and was asked to provide details. The requests were for £5,000 to maintain the cricket square and £10,000 to make grants to local groups. On the former, Cllr Lambert provided no details of how this expenditure might be recouped from users of the square. On the latter, he believed that such grants would assist, for example, with supporting the youth of the village to play sport and would provide an opportunity to support other groups providing services for parishioners, but he did not identify any specific potential beneficiaries. Cllr Lambert understood that there was insufficient money in the proposed budget to support his suggestions and suggested that the Precept be raised to cover this. After further brief discussion he withdrew his proposals.

Cllr Groslin asked about the possibility of additional security for the Tractor Shed, Cllr Dorn explained that provision had been made for this. Cllr Lambert expressed the opinion that seeking to refurbish the Pavilion was a waste of money.

There being no further questions or comments Cllr Argent proposed the Budget and Precept as listed (£57,020) be agreed. This proposal was seconded by Cllr Groslin and **AGREED** (In Favour 7:1 Against).

14/16 Payments and Purchases to be made.

In response to a query Cllr Argent advised that the price of the Dumpy Bin was £10 + VAT per week. The payments as listed were proposed for authorisation by Cllr Dorn, seconded by Cllr Groslin and **AGREED** unanimously.

The Purchases as listed (including those for the new tractor and mower) were proposed for acceptance by Cllr Dorn, seconded by Cllr Hebborn and **AGREED** (In Favour 7:1 Against).

15/16 Finance – Balance Sheet

There were no questions on the Income and Expenditure Balance Sheet report to the end of December 2015. The report was **NOTED**.

PARISH COUNCIL REPORTS

16/16 Estates Report.

Cllr Lambert expressed his concerns about the state of the football pitch considering the wet weather and why the use of it had not been stopped. It was reported that no-one had used the football field for at least three weeks and that it was recognised that the pitch was in a poor state. The Clerk replied that should teams wish to play then the referee would make the decision whether play could go ahead based on safety considerations. Cllr Lambert stated that it was the Council's right to stop playing on the pitch.

The Clerk's report had been circulated in advance. The report was **NOTED**.

17/16 Memorial Applications and Burials.

The Clerk's previously circulated report was taken as read and **NOTED**.

18/16 Correspondence

The Clerk reported receipt of an e-mail from Hart DC including a consultation on 'A minor review of Hart District Council Gambling Policy (Statement of Principles)'. Cllr Hebborn kindly reviewed this on behalf of Council and advised he saw no reason to respond.

The Clerk reported receipt of the magazine Clerks and Councils Direct which is available should anyone wish to read it.

19/16 AOB:

Cllr Lambert asked whether council was planning to do anything regarding the provision of toilets for playground users during the summer months. The Clerk would look into this.

Cllr Lambert advised that students were using the Village Hall to create a film as part of their studies.

Cllr Fortune warned that stolen vehicles are being 'parked up' in rural locations to see whether they are 'tracked'. He advised that anyone seeing a 'high end vehicle' parked in an unusual place for a while contact the police.

Cllr Argent asked whether a reply had been sent to Rosemary Wilson regarding her tennis court e-mail; the Clerk would do this. Cllr Dorn agreed to chase the promised inspection.

Cllr Bryant reported the distress of a visitor to the Burial ground as a dog had been allowed to roam free. It was agreed that whilst dogs were welcomed in the burial ground they should be under control and that Councillors and staff should have no hesitation in making people aware of their responsibilities in this regard.

Signed as a true record dated 22/02/2016

Attached – Annex 1

ANNEX 1

Crondall Parish Council Response to Planning Application 15/02989/FUL

The Parish Council wishes to raise an **OBJECTION** to the application for the following reasons:

1. The site sits at the heart of the historic village, developing this area will **destroy the ability to trace the origins of the village**. Whilst the need for additional housing within the parish is recognised there are other more suitable sites that can be developed that do not harm the rural and historic character of the village.
2. **Contrary to Conservation Area Legislation** and to current local plan policy CON13 as the scheme does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this designated conservation area, only tries to minimise its impact.
3. **Contrary to current local plan policy** CON22 as the scheme results in a loss of important open space and will adversely affect the character of the Conservation Area and of the setting of this historical village and associated listed buildings.
4. **Contrary to Conservation Area Document** approved by Hart District Council on 1st July 2010.
5. The scheme has a **negative impact on surrounding listed buildings** by reason of the proposal's scale, prominence, layout, and siting which is contrary to policy GEN 1 and RUR20
 - Scale – heights are excessive, this development located on elevated land will compound the negative impact that the development will have, dwarfing the adjacent listed buildings
 - Layout - introducing bulky built form to this open space erodes the village's rural character
 - Siting – inappropriate siting of properties resulting in uncharacteristic back to back dwellings and overlooking
6. By reason of the proposal's scale, height, layout and siting the scheme is **inappropriate in the Conservation Area** and has a negative impact on a number of listed buildings, contrary to policies GEN 1 and RUR20. Note that although the number of units proposed by this scheme is less than the scheme dismissed at appeal in 2004, the built up area has been increased.
7. **Insufficient open space provision**, which is a smaller area than that shown in the scheme dismissed at appeal in 2004. It is not large enough to provide any function apart from visual. The scheme proposes to change its visual nature from rural to a semi-urban in character, which is contrary to conservation area policy CON20.
8. The Application pays lip service to the idea that the proposed 'flower meadow' will be guaranteed as **open space in perpetuity**, providing no legal detail at all of how this could realistically be achieved, or indeed who would own it and manage it. Therefore this open space cannot be considered as a benefit.
9. The provision of car parking spaces and footpath will widen Croft Lane resulting in the **loss of its rural appearance**.

10. There are no details regarding the '**proposed road crossing**', which in itself would add to the unacceptable urbanisation of this country lane. Note, accident statistics do not report the number of near misses involving children and the occasional dog at this junction.
11. **Inadequate parking provision**, the proposed scheme shows a number of spaces which are head to tail and would be therefore be impossible to access at all times. Also there is no scope to provide additional spaces (in accordance with Hart's planning guidance) if the many large loft spaces are converted to bedrooms.
12. There are very few **existing employment opportunities** in the Parish and the proposed development will not generate any so most new residents will be commuters constituting unsustainable development.
13. The location of the development will **generate traffic** in an inappropriate part of an historic village, causing detrimental harm to country roads contrary to policy GEN1(x). Note that any development to the south of the village (as this one) will generate commuters who will inevitably cause extra traffic around the village centre particularly at the Dippenhall Street / Pankridge Street / The Borough junction. This has suffered from a number of vehicular accidents to listed buildings in recent years, particularly at peak traffic times. Also note that traffic levels have increased through the village since the last appeal.
14. The **current poor state** of the hedging and trees on the site (which may even be deliberate) is **no justification** whatsoever for building on it. A couple of days work by appropriate contractors and reasonable maintenance thereafter, is all that's needed.
15. Inappropriate development of land that is substantially higher than that of the surrounding land will add to **surface water flooding** to the surrounding area. Note, Crondall is located in a basin and this site is particularly important to provide a soak away for surface water in the immediate vicinity. Developing it, and adding substantial 'hard' landscaping in the form of houses, drives, roads etc. is likely to add significantly to what is already a regular flooding problem, especially in Dippenhall Street.
16. The scheme would impact negatively on the **local ecology**, the site is known to house hedgehogs and is used by foxes, badgers, owls, bats, buzzards and hawks etc.
17. The scheme does not address the **inadequate sewage system** which has resulted in a number of properties in the village being flooded with sewage on numerous occasions. This proposed development represents a substantial increase in the number of dwellings in this part of the village. Thames Water has already recognised that the sewage system is at full capacity and cannot accept more waste unless some major improvements are undertaken.
18. The number of dwellings proposed will exacerbate the **light pollution** within the village.
19. **Inappropriate landscaping details** which do not preserve or enhance the "sylvan" appearance of the site
20. **No Cross section plans** have been supplied in order to enable full consideration of the of impact of the development on surrounding properties

21. The scheme does not include specified amenity improvements for Crondall Parish including addressing wider traffic issues, provision of high-speed broadband, sewage facility improvements etc.

Crondall Parish Council Response to Planning Application 15/02989/FUL

The Parish Council wishes to raise an OBJECTION to the application however should permission be granted, the following conditions should be attached:

1. Permitted development rights to extend into loft/ roof space of dwellings and garages should be removed in order to protect neighbours from overlooking and the need to provide additional parking spaces.
2. Permitted development rights to build shed / garages and change surface treatments within the curtilage of a dwelling should be removed to protect the openness of the site (What's left of it), and to minimise effect of development on surface water runoff.
3. Commencement of scheme not to begin until a legal agreement is in place ensuring beyond doubt that the remaining open space will remain open space and acceptably managed in perpetuity.
4. The provision of a pedestrian crossing should be facilitated in a way to minimise its impact on a rural lane.
5. Landscaping, such as hedging and trees should be maintained to acceptable standards
6. Hours of operation – need to bar access to site between 8.30 - 9am and 3 - 4pm during term times as this is peak drop off / collection time for the primary school.
7. Use of obscure glass where appropriate, to minimise overlooking
8. Construction plan, to manage dust, vehicle movements etc.
9. Landscaping to be completed before occupation of first dwelling.
10. Surface water drainage details to be submitted, agreed and implemented before occupation of first dwelling.
11. Sewage scheme to be submitted and agreed before works on dwellings commence.
12. Ensure no provision of street lighting or external movement detecting floodlights.
13. No cellars permitted.
14. All Section 106 / CiL contributions to be passed to the Parish Council for local use.