

## **SPECIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Date and Time:** Wednesday, 19th March 2008 at 7.00 pm

**Place:** Princes Hall, Aldershot

**Present:**

### **COUNCILLORS –**

Street - (Chairman)

|           |           |            |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Ambler    | Crookes   | Kinnell    |
| Appleton  | Eastwood  | Parker     |
| Bennison  | Einchcomb | Radley J E |
| Blewett   | Gotel     | Simpson    |
| Cockarill | Henderson | Wheale     |

Officers in Attendance:

|                  |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|
| Matthew Evans    | - | Head of Planning and Environmental Regulation |
| Robert Jackson   | - | Development Control Manager                   |
| Tricia Jackson   | - | Senior Committee Services Officer             |
| Chris Guy        | - | Head of Shared Legal Services                 |
| Andrew Ratcliffe | - | Landscape and Conservation Manager            |
| Tim Wall         | - | Hampshire County Council Highways             |
| Chris Walton     | - | Hampshire County Council Highways             |

### **112. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2008 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

### **113. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gorys and Hammersley.

### **114. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman announced that the Committee's decision must be robust and should not include reasons for refusal which could not be fully supported.

However, the Committee did not have a monopoly on matters, and on the assumption that the recommendation was followed and an Appeal took place, this did not prevent others from attending the Public Inquiry and giving their views to the Inspector.

If they wrote to the Planning Inspectorate sooner rather than later they could ask for "Rule 6 status". This would put certain obligations on them to provide proofs of evidence for the Inquiry but would also allow them to ask questions of the appellants' witnesses. A Rule 6 party could, with appropriate warning, raise topics and issues which the Council, as Local Planning Authority, had not done.

This would mean that just because the Council had not refused an application for a particular reason that topic was not outside the remit of any Public Inquiry.

**115. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (PERSONAL OR PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL)**

Councillor Gotel declared a personal interest in the applications as he had previously been employed at the site.

**116. PYESTOCK APPLICATIONS**

**(1) APPLICATION FOR OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION – PART DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, ERECTION OF NEW BUILDINGS TO USE WITHIN CLASS B8 (WAREHOUSING AND DISTRIBUTION) AND ANCILLARY OFFICES, WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING, GROUNDWORKS, INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING (07/00764/MAJOR) AT PYESTOCK NORTH, HARTLAND PARK, IVELEY ROAD, FARNBOROUGH, HAMPSHIRE**

RESOLVED

That the Secretary of State be advised that had the Local Planning Authority been in a position to determine the application, Permission would have been REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. No commitment has been fully agreed nor secured for the following:
  - (a) Wildlife Management Plan.
  - (b) Construction Environment Management Plan.As such, the proposed development fails to comply with Policies GEN6, GEN8, GEN9, CON8, CON3, CON4 and CON5 of the Local Plan.
2. The noise assessment submitted with the application fails to give robust evidence to ensure that the likely noise resulting from the proposed development will not have an impact upon the surrounding local residents using all appropriate methodologies. As such, it is considered the proposed development may have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the surrounding residents. As such, the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy GEN6 of the Replacement Local Plan.
3. The application fails to include adequate noise mitigation on Minley Link which thus adversely affects the amenity of residents in adjacent roads contrary to saved Adopted Local Plan policy GEN1(viii), GEN1(ix) and GEN1(x) and the advice in PPG24.
4. In the absence of credible evidence that there will be no air quality and dust propagation issues causing detriment to the amenity of local interests of established importance, this would be contrary to Saved Policies GEN1 (ii), CON2, CON3 and CON6 and PPS23.
5. The proposal would result in industrial development within the strategic gap involving warehouses that are larger in terms of scale, bulk and floor space than the existing buildings on the site, extensive car and lorry parking, intensive heavy vehicular activity and significant loss of existing woodland

screening. It is therefore considered that the proposal would physically and visually diminish the open nature of the strategic gap, leading to a degree of coalescence and would thereby cause unacceptable harm to the rural character of the area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy G1 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies CON19 and DEV12 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan and Policy CC10b of the draft South East Plan.

- 6.. Implementation of the proposed roundabout on Ively Road, together with the views of the proposed development from it, will form an urbanising feature on a road in the open countryside which will have an adverse effect on the Strategic Gap contrary to Structure Plan Policy G1(ii) and Saved Adopted Local Plan policies DEV12, CON19 and RUR2 and draft South East Plan Policy CC10b.
7. In the absence of a robust and sustainable traffic assessment, the Local Planning Authority is unable to assess whether the proposed development accords with the requirements of Saved Policy T15 and the advice in PPG13.
8. In the absence of a financial contribution towards the North Hampshire Transport Strategy (NHTS) for improvements to the pedestrian and cycle network connecting the site with surrounding areas, the development proposals cannot be reconciled with planning policy guidance, particularly PP13 in that the development fails to provide adequate facilities to access the site by walking and cycling and fails to make best possible use of opportunities to reduce the reliance upon the private car to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposals are therefore contrary to PPG13, PPG4, Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1, T14 and T16 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.
9. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure in perpetuity the provision of a bus service serving for the site connecting with local transport facilities and urban areas the development proposals cannot be reconciled with planning policy guidance, particularly PP13 in that the development fails to provide an adequate choice of transport modes and is located in an area poorly served by public transport. This is likely to lead to an increased reliance upon the private car to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposals are therefore contrary to PPG13, PPG4, Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1 and T14 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.
10. In the absence of an approved travel plan and an appropriate mechanism to secure its continued implementation, monitoring the enforcement the development proposals cannot be reconciled with PPG13 in that they fail to provide adequately for sustainable transport and do not make the best possible use of opportunities to reduce reliance upon the private car, to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposals are therefore contrary to PPG13, PPG4, Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1 and T14 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.

11. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the necessary highway works, the development proposals cannot be reconciled planning policy in that they fail to secure appropriate and adequate access and provide for infrastructure improvements made necessary by the proposed development, to the detriment of road safety and the environment. The proposals are therefore contrary to Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1, T14 and T15 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.
12. In the absence of an appropriate legal agreement to cap the traffic generation and lorry routing from the site, together with appropriate mechanisms to prevent inappropriate use of the local highway network in the event that the access to the M3 motorway becomes unavailable, the proposed development is unacceptable and would cause undue interference with the safety and free flow of the local highway network. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1 and T14 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.
13. In the absence of demonstrably adequate proposals for the use of renewable energy sources, this development is contrary to RPG9 Policy INF5 and the advice in the Supplement to PPS1 on Climate Change.
14. The proposal has led to overwhelming public concern reflecting the sound planning reasons for refusal as set out above in this decision notice which concern would adversely affect the quality of life for those affected by the development.

Informatives:

1. The applicant is advised that any future application for this site should be accompanied by a full, up to date and robust assessment on ecology on the site and vicinity.
2. The applicant is advised that the submitted lighting scheme is deficient. Any future application for this site should be accompanied by an enhanced lighting scheme which would have less impact on the area, particularly in the Bramshott Road area.

**(2) APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING PERMISSION – ERECTION OF NEW BUILDINGS TO USE WITHIN CLASS B8 AND ANCILLARY OFFICES, WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING, GRBOUNDWORKS, INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING, FOLLOWING PART DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS (07/03197/MAJOR) AT PYESTOCK NORTH, HARTLAND PARK, IVELEY ROAD, FARNBOROUGH, HAMPSHIRE**

Permission REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. No commitment has been fully agreed nor secured for the following:
  - (a) Wildlife Management Plan.
  - (b) Construction Environment Management Plan.

As such, the proposed development fails to comply with Policies GEN6, GEN8, GEN9, CON8, CON3, CON4 and CON5 of the Local Plan.

2. The noise assessment submitted with the application fails to give robust evidence to ensure that the likely noise resulting from the proposed development will not have an impact upon the surrounding local residents using all appropriate methodologies. As such, it is considered the proposed development may have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the surrounding residents. As such, the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy GEN6 of the Replacement Local Plan.
3. The application fails to include adequate noise mitigation on Minley Link which thus adversely affects the amenity of residents in adjacent roads contrary to saved Adopted Local Plan policy GEN1(viii), GEN1(ix) and GEN1(x) and the advice in PPG24.
4. In the absence of credible evidence that there will be no air quality and dust propagation issues causing detriment to the amenity of local interests of established importance, this would be contrary to Saved Policies GEN1 (ii), CON2, CON3 and CON6 and PPS23.
5. The proposal would result in industrial development within the strategic gap involving warehouses that are larger in terms of scale, bulk and floor space than the existing buildings on the site, extensive car and lorry parking, intensive heavy vehicular activity and significant loss of existing woodland screening. It is therefore considered that the proposal would physically and visually diminish the open nature of the strategic gap, leading to a degree of coalescence and would thereby cause unacceptable harm to the rural character of the area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy G1 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies CON19 and DEV12 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan and Policy CC10b of the draft South East Plan.
- 6.. Implementation of the proposed roundabout on Ively Road, together with the views of the proposed development from it, will form an urbanising feature on a road in the open countryside which will have an adverse effect on the Strategic Gap contrary to Structure Plan Policy G1(ii) and Saved Adopted Local Plan policies DEV12, CON19 and RUR2 and draft South East Plan Policy CC10b.
7. In the absence of a robust and sustainable traffic assessment, the Local Planning Authority is unable to assess whether the proposed development accords with the requirements of Saved Policy T15 and the advice in PPG13.
8. In the absence of a financial contribution towards the North Hampshire Transport Strategy (NHTS) for improvements to the pedestrian and cycle network connecting the site with surrounding areas, the development proposals cannot be reconciled with planning policy guidance, particularly PP13 in that the development fails to provide adequate facilities to access the site by walking and cycling and fails to make best possible use of opportunities to reduce the reliance upon the private car to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposals are therefore contrary to

PPG13, PPG4, Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1, T14 and T16 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.

9. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure in perpetuity the provision of a bus service serving for the site connecting with local transport facilities and urban areas the development proposals cannot be reconciled with planning policy guidance, particularly PP13 in that the development fails to provide an adequate choice of transport modes and is located in an area poorly served by public transport. This is likely to lead to an increased reliance upon the private car to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposals are therefore contrary to PPG13, PPG4, Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1 and T14 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.
10. In the absence of an approved travel plan and an appropriate mechanism to secure its continued implementation, monitoring the enforcement the development proposals cannot be reconciled with PPG13 in that they fail to provide adequately for sustainable transport and do not make the best possible use of opportunities to reduce reliance upon the private car, to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposals are therefore contrary to PPG13, PPG4, Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1 and T14 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.
11. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the necessary highway works, the development proposals cannot be reconciled planning policy in that they fail to secure appropriate and adequate access and provide for infrastructure improvements made necessary by the proposed development, to the detriment of road safety and the environment. The proposals are therefore contrary to Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1, T14 and T15 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.
12. In the absence of an appropriate legal agreement to cap the traffic generation and lorry routing from the site, together with appropriate mechanisms to prevent inappropriate use of the local highway network in the event that the access to the M3 motorway becomes unavailable, the proposed development is unacceptable and would cause undue interference with the safety and free flow of the local highway network. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with Saved Policy T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and Saved Policies GEN1 and T14 of the Hart District Council Replacement Local Plan.
13. In the absence of demonstrably adequate proposals for the use of renewable energy sources, this development is contrary to RPG9 Policy INF5 and the advice in the Supplement to PPS1 on Climate Change.
14. The proposal has led to overwhelming public concern reflecting the sound planning reasons for refusal as set out above in this decision notice which concern would adversely affect the quality of life for those affected by the development.

Informatives:

1. The applicant is advised that any future application for this site should be accompanied by a full, up to date and robust assessment on ecology on the site and vicinity.
2. The applicant is advised that the submitted lighting scheme is deficient. Any future application for this site should be accompanied by an enhanced lighting scheme which would have less impact on the area, particularly in the Bramshott Road area.

Note:

- (1) In accordance with Standing Order No 117, Standing Order No 93(b) (General Prohibitions) was suspended during the duration of the meeting.
- (2) The following spoke FOR the application:  
Justin Gartland (Development Plan Policies AND Employment issues including Socio-Economic issues)  
David Bird (Traffic Generation)  
James Wicher (Noise & Air Quality)  
Martin Kelly (Visual issues including effect on Strategic Gap)  
Dr Topsy Rudd (Ecological Issues)  
Michael Sparks (Conclusion)

The following spoke AGAINST the application:

Mr Bob Schofield (Development Plan Policies, Traffic Generation, Visual issues including effect on Strategic Gap and Conclusion)  
Dr Stephen Roome (Noise & Air Quality)  
Mr David Healey (Ecological Issues)  
Mr Steven Cribbes (Employment issues including Socio-Economic issues)

Mr John Thorne (on behalf of Rushmoor Borough Council) spoke AGAINST the application.

- (3) The meeting was adjourned between 9.50 and 10.05 pm
- (4) In accordance with Standing Order 84, a recorded vote was requested on a Motion to amend the Recommendation for Refusal as listed in Appendix 2 of the report of the Head of Planning and Environmental Regulation, the result of which was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION

Councillors Ambler, Appleton, Bennison, Blewett, Cockarill, Crookes, Eastwood, Einchcomb, Gotel, Henderson, Kinnell, Parker, Radley J E, Simpson and Wheale.

AGAINST THE MOTION

None

ABSTENTIONS

None

The Motion was, therefore, CARRIED unanimously.

The meeting closed at 11.32 pm