



BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK PARISH COUNCIL

www.bramshottandliphook-pc.gov.uk

Mr A S R GROVES
CLERK

Tel: 01428 722988

Fax: 01428 727335

e-mail : council@bramshottandliphook-pc.gov.uk

**THE PARISH OFFICE
HASKELL CENTRE
MIDHURST ROAD
LIPHOOK
HAMPSHIRE GU30 7TN**

**A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE TOOK PLACE AT 8.00PM IN
THE HASKELL CENTRE, MIDHURST ROAD, LIPHOOK ON MONDAY 18
JUNE 2012.**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr D Jerrard (Chairman), Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr R Evans, Cllr Ms J Poole, Cllr P Robinson & Cllr J Tough. Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) also attended, together with Mr C Paterson (SDNPA) & two members of the public for part of the meeting.

60/12 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman asked those present to switch off mobile phones, made them aware of the loop system & pointed out the fire exits.

He proposed that Item 10 (Community Planning presentation) should be brought forward on the agenda to be covered after Item 6. This was agreed.

61/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr M Croucher, Cllr P Jordan & Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden).

62/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Tough declared an interest in the application at 2 Beechtree Cottages, Conford (Minute 68/12.3) as the applicant was a colleague at the Youth Club

63/12 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 21 MAY 2012

These were confirmed & signed as being a true record of the meeting.

64/12 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chairman advised members that none of the actions arising from the meeting had been conducted yet.

65/12 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman proposed Cllr Mrs Easton to continue as Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee. This was seconded by Cllr Robinson & agreed by all.

66/12

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

Public Questions (items not on the agenda). None.

Members'/Public Participation (Code of Conduct, Paragraph 12 (2)). None.

Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman.

67/12

COMMUNITY PLANNING (Appendix 1)

Chris Paterson (SDNPA) gave a short presentation about Neighbourhood Planning. He explained that it was just one of a variety of community planning tools, which many parishes use to move their Parish Plan forward. His colleague, Andrew Triggs, the SDNPA's Neighbourhood Planning Officer had agreed to speak to the Parish Council about the specifics of Neighbourhood Plans & provide advice about how to conduct one. Around 230 parishes had been awarded 'Front Runner' status & had been given £20,000 to help produce a Neighbourhood Plan, in return for providing feedback/guidance. This group included three local parishes within the SDNPA area, namely Fernhurst, Findon & Petersfield.

He provided four documents (An introduction to Neighbourhood Planning; Neighbourhood Planning - FAQ; An Introduction to the Community Right to Build; Neighbourhood Planning - a Guide for Ward Councillors) for circulation to councillors, together with copies of his presentation. He then invited questions.

Cllr Mrs Easton: Dangers for large Parish Council not producing Neighbourhood Plan?

A. None if consider Local Plan policies would protect Liphook, but producing one would give greater confidence & Government pushing Neighbourhood Plans.

The Chairman: What is focus of Fernhurst Neighbourhood Plan?

A. Focuses on one site as concerned about future development on that site.

Cllr Robinson: Adoption of Community Right to Build makes Parish Council Planning Authority on small scale?

A. For example, improvement to a village hall - drawing up a Community Right to Build Order would ensure that any funds raised from development of particular site would be put towards improvements to the village hall.

Cllr Robinson: What happens if developer approaches EHDC/SDNPA if Neighbourhood Plan finalised?

A. Planning Authority would be required by law to use Neighbourhood Plan policies to consider any proposals.

Cllr Tough: Definition of 'community' - could developer submit Neighbourhood Plan?

A. Only Parish Councils eligible to submit Neighbourhood Plan. Parish Council to act as facilitator for community, for example conducting workshops/other events to gather community views. Government not specifying definition of community - referendum would be final test of community involvement/approval.

Cllr Tough: Referendum to judge whole Neighbourhood Plan?

A. All electorate can vote, but must vote either 'Yes' or 'No'.

Cllr Mrs Easton: Who would pay for referendum?

A. Local Planning Authority would be responsible.

Cllr Mrs Easton: Neighbourhood Plans only relate to the built environment?

A. Could be spacial expression of Parish Plan, for example identifying areas suitable/not suitable for development.

Cllr Tough: Who would provide expertise?

A. In Local Authorities' interests to provide support.

The Chairman: Scope for broader plan incorporating other parishes?

A. Current proposal in East Sussex for four Parish Councils to produce joint Neighbourhood Plan - worth speaking to neighbouring parishes.

68/12.1

31030/008 **Single-storey extension to rear - 11 Hunters Chase, Liphook** **Mr & Mrs Smith**
Cllr P Robinson

Cllr Robinson reported that the house was in the middle of a terrace & he had been unable to view the site as the applicant had not been available when he had visited. There was permission to convert the garage into a utility room, shower & cycle/bin store, but this had not been done. The current application was for an extension for a kitchen/utility room in place of a large mock Victorian conservatory. He could not see any reason to object as other properties had similar extensions & the windows would only overlook the applicant's garden.

Decision: No objections.

68/12.2

31912/002 **Pair of semi-detached dwellings & detached house, after** **Mr Sheppard**
Cllr R Evans **demolition of existing single-storey dwelling - 18 Tower**
Close, Liphook

Cllr Evans had spoken to the neighbour at 16 Tower Rd, on the corner of the development, who was not concerned as it was such a large plot. The neighbour at the adjacent property, 20 Tower Rd, was away, but he understood that they were concerned about loss of light as the existing bungalow was to be replaced with a house, which would be closer to the boundary. He confirmed that there would be no windows overlooking 20 Tower Rd & the Chairman added that there were very few windows in the new houses.

Cllr Mrs Easton pointed out that the new access would be further away from the junction with Tower Close & therefore less dangerous.

Cllr Tough considered that replacing one bungalow with three houses would constitute over-development.

Cllr Evans confirmed that most of the surrounding properties were detached houses, except 16 Tower Rd which was a bungalow, & that most were in reasonable sized plots, whereas these new houses would be in relatively smaller plots.

It was agreed to object on the grounds of over-development.

Decision: Object as over-development of plot & therefore detrimental to neighbouring properties. Consider that plot could only support two detached dwellings, which should be positioned in-line with Tower Rd build-line in order to prevent any blocking of light to neighbouring properties.

68/12.3

38032/002 **French casement windows to first floor with balcony** **Mr Frankland**
Cllr P Robinson **- 2 Beechtree Cottages, Conford Rd, Conford**

Cllr Robinson explained that the application was to enlarge an existing first-floor window & erect an oak balcony on top of an existing small extension. This would afford the homeowner extensive & attractive views over their own garden & the countryside beyond, but would not overlook any neighbouring properties.

Decision: No objections.

68/12.7

54324 **Conversion of detached double garage to habitable living** **Mr Gruhn**
Cllr J Tough **accommodation - Monk House, Limes Close, Bramshott**

Cllr Tough reported that Monk House was a Grade II listed building & was originally part of Bramshott School for Boys. The garage was originally a toilet block, which was converted into a garage in 1983, & the applicant now wanted to change it into a house. There would be no change to the exterior, except for replacing the garage doors with a wooden infill containing doors/windows, which would face into the courtyard. It would be a studio development with a living room, store & bathroom. The application did not state who would use it or whether it would be ancillary to the main house. It was difficult to use the garage as the turn into it was at an acute angle. The site was well screened by a large hedge, so this would not affect the neighbours.

Cllr Mrs Easton considered that a caveat should be added to ensure that it should only be used as ancillary accommodation for the main house.

Decision: No objections provided remains as ancillary accommodation to the main house.

69/12 **ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS**

69/12.1

21150/008 **Single-storey extension to side, after demolition of existing** **Mr Murdoch**
Cllr Mrs B Easton **extension - Bramshott Chase House, Bramshott Chase Lane,**
Hindhead

Cllr Mrs Easton stated that the house was in a very large, well screened plot at the far end of Bramshott Chase Lane. No trees would be affected. It was a very beautiful house & this would further improve the appearance.

Decision: No objections.

69/12.2

24052/001 **Two-storey extension to side - 12 Field Place, Liphook** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr Mrs B Easton **Hawksley**

Cllr Mrs Easton explained that Field Place was a close comprising 1960's terraced houses & this house was at the end of a terrace next to the Fire Station. The extension would not be seen from the other houses & there would still be sufficient access to the rear garden.

Decision: No objections.

69/12.3

50053/001 **Two-storey extension to side & rear, following demolition of** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr Ms J Poole **conservatory - 15 Hollycombe Close, Liphook** **Doyle**

Cllr Ms Poole reported that the site was on a corner, adjacent to an electricity sub-station. She had not been able to speak to the neighbours but, although it would be a fairly substantial extension, in practice it would be unlikely to affect anyone else. It would involve a large expanse of new roof, which would probably be constructed in stages. It would increase the property by a great deal, but as the site was within the Settlement Boundary the '50% rule' would not apply. Many of the surrounding properties had had large extensions & this should look quite attractive.

Decision: No objections.

TREE APPLICATION

69/12.4

34714/002 **Crown-lift two beech trees to provide 2-4m clearance above** **Mr Lunnon**
Dr M Evans **ground level - 127 Haslemere Rd, Liphook**

Dr Evans was unable to attend the meeting, but had submitted a report which was read out to members. The tree was overhanging the public highway & therefore there was no alternative but to prune it to provide the necessary clearance. In any event, the proposed work would not be detrimental to the tree & Dr Evans recommended agreeing to the proposals.

Decision: No objections.

70/12 **RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 2)**

These were noted.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10.00pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 16 July 2012.

Signed
Presiding Chairman