

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF TADLEY TOWN COUNCIL HIGHWAYS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD VIA ZOOM AT 7.30PM ON 29 MARCH 2021**

**Present:** Cllrs Bower, Burdett, Lovegrove, Mullan (Chairman), Page, Slimin, Spence and Witton

**In Attendance:** Clerk, Borough Cllr Bound, 2 members of the public (from 7.30pm), 2 members of the public (from 7.50pm)

**1. APOLOGIES**

There were none.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATION REQUESTS**

All Cllrs declared an interest in 21/00519/FUL Church Brook Farm, Church Brook.

**3. MINUTES**

14/21HP It was

**RESOLVED (8/0/0)** to receive and confirm the accuracy of the minutes of the Highways and Planning Committee Meeting held on 22 February 2021.

**4. OPEN FORUM**

There was no requirement for an open forum.

**5. CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**21/00519/FUL Church Brook Farm, Church Brook**

A B Alexander & Sons

**Proposal:** Change of use of outbuilding to a Ceramics Pottery Studio, Paint a Pot

<https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QOFA27CRKDK00>

**Noted.**

**21/00514/HSE 52 Fairlawn Road**

Mr P Chapman

**Proposal:** Erection of a two storey side extension and creation of first floor accommodation, involving raising of the roof and installation of roof lights in the east and west roof slopes and first floor window in the north elevation. Alterations to ground floor fenestrations.

<https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QOEYKYCR0AQ00>

**Comment (8/0/0):** No objection

**21/00669/LDPO 18A Tadley Hill**

Mr & Mrs Davies

**Proposal:** Certificate of lawfulness for the conversion of loft including the installation of three roof windows into the pitched roof of the front elevation and the addition of a dormer at the rear

<https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QOYA93CRKVB00>

**Comment (8/0/0):** No objection

**21/00793/GPDE 26 Birch Road**

Mr & Mrs McLaughlin

**Proposal:** Erection of a single storey rear extension with pitched roof (permitted development notification)

<https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QPFZVPCR0AP00>

**Comment (8/0/0):** No objection

**21/00601/FUL**            **Land adjoining 11 Burnham Road**

Mrs D Brazil

**Proposal:** Erection of detached dwelling

<https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QQQFWICR0AP00>

**Comment (8/0/0):** Strongly object. Would be disappointed to see the loss of open space. The proposed development does not fit with the existing street scene and does not contribute to the character and visual amenities of the area. The Tadley Design Statement page 7 refers to the advantageous design of the AWE estates because of the large areas of open space and page 18 states that 'One of the urban characteristics of urban Tadley is .....the wealth of mature trees and open spaces.' Very concerned that proposed fencing around the site would greatly impede visibility around what is a narrow T junction, that usually has vehicles parked opposite. Believe MOD Estates placed a covenant on the land that prohibits building on the site. Request a site visit be carried out.

**21/00671/FUL**            **42-46 New Road**

McCarthy & Stone

**Proposal:** Erection of 42 retirement living apartments (Category II Type) with communal facilities, landscaping and car parking. Erection of a Class A1 Retail store with 5 flats at first floor level, car parking and service layby

<https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QOZ7NFCRKVV00>

[https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/files/20B5545CDC95E74A013F36894B1D7C3C/pdf/21\\_00671\\_FUL-SUMMARY\\_OF\\_AFFORDABLE\\_HOUSING-5835163.pdf](https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/files/20B5545CDC95E74A013F36894B1D7C3C/pdf/21_00671_FUL-SUMMARY_OF_AFFORDABLE_HOUSING-5835163.pdf)

**Comment (8/0/0):** Object.

Pleased to see an affordable housing cascade mechanism but would like some reassurances from Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council that the Registered Provider will be one of the existing well-established providers. Options 2 and 4 offer a commuted sum which will be of little benefit to Tadley residents, there is a shortage of land for development in Tadley and all the land that is available is privately owned and therefore won't be used for affordable housing. Concerned as to how having 2 different organisations managing properties on the site is going to work in practice.

We agree there is a need for smaller/retirement homes to allow residents to downsize, however we are aware that McCarthy & Stone homes are aimed at the higher end of the market and their properties would therefore probably be out of the reach of a lot of our residents wanting to downsize. Looking on the McCarthy & Stone website, a development in Alton is marketing 1 beds for £280000 and 2 beds for £385000 and a development in Didcot is marketing 1 beds for £270000 and 2 beds for £299000. Those sorts of prices are more likely to attract those living nearer to London wanting to downsize so of no benefit to our residents.

Object to the height of the retirement building, this is out of keeping with the existing street scene and therefore should be limited to 2 storeys. A 3 storey development also comprises overdevelopment of the site. Concerned that a 3 storey building will overlook the adjacent Bishopswood infant and junior schools. Children from the schools use the area right up to the border with the site, concerned about safeguarding, suggest some sort of screening is installed. Also concerned about the evacuation of elderly people from a 3 storey building in an emergency situation, such as a fire, when lifts would be out of operation.

Note there is no parking barrier for the parking spaces allocated to the 5 flats above the retail unit.

No consideration for how ambulances and delivery vehicles will enter the car park (that has a barrier) for the retirement flats.

The proposal does not show any pedal or motor cycle parking for residents, staff and visitors. In addition, there is no pick up or drop off facility for taxis, chemist deliveries or any other deliveries.

Disappointed with the proposal for a Co-op on the site when there is a small independently run convenience store nearby. The Co-op would almost certainly put the Koala store out of business. It would be good to see some other retail development on the site which would increase the diversity of shops in the town. The Statement of Community Involvement (page 11) raises this as an issue but it is not addressed adequately.

Local doctor's surgeries are already struggling to serve the residents of Tadley and adjoining parishes, this development will undoubtedly put even more strain on the surgeries. The Statement of Community Involvement (page 12) raises this as an issue but the response addresses the impact on hospital accommodation and not the impact on local doctor's surgeries. Morland Surgery which is adjacent to the site is currently not taking on any new patients. Consideration in this respect also needs to be given to the planning approval already given for 15/03090/FUL 120-bedroom care home at Bishopswood Golf Course. Note that Tadley lost one of its dental surgeries in November 2018 so there is going to be a shortfall in dental provision too.

Concerned that as there is no pedestrian crossing in New Road, elderly residents would have difficulty crossing a very busy road.

The site is located within the AWE 3km exclusion zone.

Sad to see the closure of Reading Warehouse which has been a real asset to the town saving residents a trip to Basingstoke, Newbury or Reading for white goods, furniture and lots more.

**21/00707/HSE            8A Whitedown Road**

A S Taterski & D Taterska

**Proposal:** Erection of a single storey rear/side infill extension and erection of a porch to front of dwelling.

<https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QP1MGXCRKZD00>

**Comment (8/0/0):** No objection

**21/00777/HSE            10 Whitedown Road**

Mr & Mrs Wyllie

**Proposal:** Erection of a single storey rear extension

<https://planning.basingstoke.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QPDYUWCRLBL00>

**Comment (8/0/0):** No objection

**6.        CONSULTATIONS**

**21/00810/OOBC        AWE Aldermaston, Paices Hill, Aldermaston**

**Proposal:** Replacement facility for the storage and handling of materials

<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=21/00528/COMIND>

**Noted.**

**Proposal:** Approval of reserved matters following Outline Permission 19/02410/OUTMAJ (Outline Application for Erection of Business Units - Classes B1, B2 or B8. Matters to be considered: Access, Appearance, Layout, Scale). Matters seeking consent: landscaping.

<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=21/00593/RESMAJ>

**Comment (8/0/0):** Would like to see developers' contributions from this spent on upgrading the pavement that runs alongside Silchester Road from the Broomsquire Arms to Pamber Heath. Note the location of the accessible parking spaces are away from the units whereas the EV charging points are adjacent.

**7.      STRATEGIC GAP BETWEEN TADLEY & BAUGHURST**

Baughurst Parish Council had asked if we would reaffirm our support for the strategic gap between Tadley and Baughurst (Local Plan Policy EM2). They believe it is important for us and them to remind BDBC of the importance of this area of land to both our communities.

**14/21HP** It was

**RESOLVED (8/0/0)** to reaffirm support for the strategic gap between Tadley and Baughurst (Local Plan Policy EM2).

**8.      RAILINGS - A340 BY SAINSBURYS, MULFORDS HILL**

A quotation of £16300 for replacement of the existing railings with black style railings was received from Highways at Hampshire County Council. It was agreed to go back to Highways and request that they confirm the existing railings meet safety standards, to ask whether they would be willing to meet some of the costs of replacing the railings and to ask who would be responsible for the maintenance of replacement railings. Highways had confirmed that the railings are still fit for purpose and they cannot justify the cost of changing them just for cosmetic reasons. They had also pointed out that the damaged panels are primarily in the most vulnerable position and if they were to be replaced, are likely to be damaged again. If any damage was caused to the railings and they needed replacement, Highways would only replace with a railing that meets their standard. It was agreed not to pursue this any further.

The meeting closed at 8.05pm.

Signed: .....

Dated: 26 April 2021