



# **BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK PARISH COUNCIL**

www.bramshottandliphook-pc.gov.uk

**Mr P J STANLEY**  
**PARISH 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 7.30PM IN  
THE HASKELL CENTRE, MIDHURST ROAD, LIPHOOK ON MONDAY 13  
MAY 2013.**

## **MINUTES**

### **PRESENT WERE:**

Cllr D Jerrard (Chairman), Cllr M Croucher, Cllr R Evans, Cllr P Jordan, Cllr Ms J Kirby, Cllr T Maroney & Cllr Ms J Poole. Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) also attended, together with Cllr F Cowper (HCC/EHDC), Cllr B Moulard (EHDC), Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr E Trotter, Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden), one member of the press & 22 members of the public for parts of the meeting.

**42/13**

### **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 then explained that the Committee would discuss any applications/agenda items that members of the public had come to listen to first. For each application, the relevant committee member would explain the application, then the meeting would be adjourned to allow the public to comment on any material planning matters relating to that application & the meeting would then be reconvened for the Committee to agree their comments for submission to EHDC/SDNPA.

The Chairman proposed moving the item about possible development at Bohunt Manor to the beginning of the meeting as this was what most of the attendees had come to hear. This was agreed.

**43/13**

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr P Robinson.

**44/13**

### **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Ms J Kirby - application at land north of Westering & west of Church Rd, Bramshott (Minute 49/13.2) as she lived close to the site;

Cllr P Jordan - application at 20 The Maltings, Liphook (Minute 49/13.8) as he was an immediate neighbour.

**45/13 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 15 APRIL 2013**  
These were confirmed & signed as being a true record of the meeting.

**46/13 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**  
There were none.

**47/13 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION**  
Public Questions (items not on the agenda). None.  
Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 42/13).

**48/13 POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT AT BOHUNT MANOR**

The Chairman advised that a pamphlet about the GVI proposals & the forthcoming exhibition on 17/18 May at LMC had been delivered to homes in the village. There would be an application in shortly for a primary school, which would be run by Bohunt School, & the Parish Council would comment on the application in due course. The SDNPA would handle the application, which would be discussed by the whole Parish Council as it would not be just a planning matter; it would also involve education & medical facilities. He had put this item on the agenda for this meeting as he considered it to be a good opportunity to explain the process & to propose that Parish Councillors should attend the exhibition, in order to view the proposals & elicit parishioner's opinions. He ascertained that neither the developer, GVI, nor their agent, G L Hearn, were in attendance at the meeting.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow the public to comment.

Firstly, Mrs Frost (Liphook Infant & Junior School) claimed that the proposal would affect all local primary schools. GVI were claiming that extra development would create the need for additional school places and therefore a new school would be required. However, she claimed that local schools did have the capacity to expand & were doing a great deal to reduce current traffic problems. GVI were claiming that local schools would not be able to cope, but had not consulted the schools.

Cllr Ms Kirby stated that EHDC had a remit to identify suitable sites for development in the District. There were a number of potential sites in the Parish, in addition to the former OSU site, Lowsley Farm & the Silent Garden, which could accommodate an additional 750 houses/other buildings within the Settlement Boundary, without going into the SDNP.

Cllr Cowper advised that the statute for the SDNP states that development will only be permitted if it furthers the aims of the National Park. He confirmed that no application had been submitted. He was attending a HCC education requirement briefing the following week, but Bohunt School was an academy & was not therefore restricted by HCC.

Mrs Frost added that the pre-application details were on the SDNPA website.

The Chairman stated that he would attend the exhibition & ask questions as the Parish Council's Planning Committee Chairman.

Cllr Jordan stated that the Parish Council had seen earlier outline proposals in 2010, which included housing. Since that time, permissions had been granted for football & cricket pitches, allotments, a medical centre & a community farm building. He noted that the current proposals no longer included a cricket pitch. He considered that the Parish Council should obtain more information, in particular about the proposed number of houses.

Cllr Mrs Easton pointed out that the permission for the medical centre had been in existence for around three years, but there had been no take-up yet as there was no funding. She therefore concluded that the promised facilities might never happen.

The Chairman stated that there would need to be consultation with both GPs & Bohunt School. He added that he did not consider this type of football stadium suitable for the National Park. Cllr Trotter agreed, particularly as flood-lights would be required.



### 49/13.3

**29879/003**                      **Single-storey extensions to front & rear, plus two-storey extension to rear following removal of existing porch & conservatory - 82 Headley Rd, Liphook**                      **Mr & Mrs Norman**  
**Cllr T Maroney**

Cllr Maroney reported that it was a semi-detached house with a two-storey extension, which had increased the size of the original house by 70%. The applicant now wanted to extend the back by a further 3.6m to create a much larger dining area/kitchen with an enlarged ensuite master bedroom above. They also wanted to enlarge the porch at the front to accommodate a cloakroom. Cllr Maroney had no objections to the porch, but considered that the rear extension would constitute over-development as it would increase the size of the original property by over 130% & would be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring property, 84 Headley Rd.

The meeting was adjourned to allow Mr Graimes (84 Headley Rd) to state that they were looking to sell their house & this would make it more difficult. It would form a large development on an already extended house, would block the light to their conservatory & could create further drainage problems. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan pointed out that this would further unbalance the two houses, which were once the same size as each other.

Cllr Maroney recommended objecting on the grounds of over-development. This was agreed.

**Decision:**                      Object on the grounds of over-development & unsuitable due to its relative size & bulk compared to the attached semi-detached house, which would make the pair of houses look unbalanced.

### 49/13.4

**33993/071; 072**                      **Addition highway information - outline application for employment use comprising mix of A2, B1C & B1A, together with new access + residential development comprising 62 dwellings with associated access, parking & open space - former OSU site Area B, Midhurst Rd, Liphook**                      **Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd & Stax Development Ltd**  
**Cllrs P Jordan**  
**/M Croucher**

Cllr Jordan reminded members that the Parish Council had supported the original applications provided that some of the residential dwellings were replaced by affordable housing. This additional information had no bearing whatsoever on the Parish Council comments as it just provided further details to answer the highway questions raised. It included amended plans to allow two vehicles to pass at the entrance area & better visibility splays, & demonstrated sufficient on-site turning points for commercial vehicles. There was therefore no reason for the Parish Council to object to this additional information.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

#### 49/13.5

**36945/005**                      **Retention of caravan for gypsy/travelling person's pitch & formation of hard-standing incl. amendments**                      **Mr Newman**  
**Cllr T Maroney**                      **- Alderwood Cottage, Queens Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Maroney advised members that 31 letters of support, 20 from Liphook residents & 11 from Bordon residents, had been handed to him at the start of the meeting. The Parish Council had seen an application in February for an extension to the existing cottage. The Parish Council had not objected & permission was granted following the receipt of an amended boundary plan. This application was for the remainder of the site, effectively splitting the site into two. Cllr Maroney understood that the land at the rear was used for stabling three horses & that a mobile home had been on the site for the past nine years. The site was surrounded by piece-meal development consisting of bungalows & other static mobile homes. The owners of the two mobile homes directly opposite expressed no objections to this application. The EHDC Case Officer had queried the applicant's gypsy status & was requesting a separate ecology report.

Cllr Jordan considered that the applicant's gypsy status was the key issue, & asked whether this was a retrospective application. Cllr Maroney confirmed that it was.

Cllr Croucher stated that this was one site which had been sub-divided into two, & permission would not be given for this without the gypsy status, as the land was in the countryside. He also considered that any permission granted should be on a temporary basis, as with the recent permission for the gypsy site in Devils Lane.

Cllr Maroney recommended objecting until the status was clarified & the required report submitted. The Chairman suggested that the permission should be temporary & tied to the specified gypsy family. This was agreed.

**Decision:**                      Object until position re: gypsy/travelling person status clarified & ecological report submitted.  
Should permission be granted, the usual restrictions to tie the permission to the named gypsy/travelling person family should apply & it should be limited to a three-year temporary permission so that the family could be re-located should a permanent site be set up within the District.

#### 49/13.6

**38102/001**                      **Two-storey extensions to side & rear, link conservatory to rear, entrance porch to front & porch extension to side**                      **Mrs Rowell**  
**Cllr P Jordan**                      **- Hartley, Headley Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Jordan reported that the proposed work was quite extensive, but the plot was exceptionally large, & while it would increase the bulk of the property considerably, it would not be out of keeping with the other properties in the area. It would have no impact on any neighbouring houses, so he could see no reason to object.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

#### 49/13.7

**54368**                      **Two-storey extension to side/rear & dormers to northeast**                      **Mr & Mrs**  
**Cllr Ms J Kirby**                      **/southwest elevations of existing house, following demolition**                      **Ryall**  
**of garage - Dobbins, Rectory Lane, Bramshott**

Cllr Ms Kirby explained that this was a detached property in a significant location in the conservation area of Bramshott; opposite St Mary's Church & at the junction of Rectory Lane, Church Lane & Church Rd. It was currently a fairly modest bungalow with a separate garage, set in extensive gardens. The application was to extend the property by creating an L-shaped building from the existing bungalow & garage.

The meeting was adjourned to allow the applicant to explain that this was to provide an annex for their disabled mother & that there was no intention to separate the annex from the main house. They had consulted with neighbours & selected a design to have minimal impact on them. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Ms Kirby added that this was a large extension, but in a large plot, so she could see no reason to object. This was agreed.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

Cllr Jordan left the meeting.

#### 49/13.8

**54870**                      **First-floor extension to side with dormer to front & partial**                      **Mr & Mrs**  
**Cllr T Maroney**                      **rebuild of garage/study on ground floor - 20 The Maltings,**                      **Cook**  
**Liphook**

Cllr Maroney reported that most of the houses were link-detached houses; many with an extension over the garage. The proposal was to replace the garage with a new utility room/store & convert the present study at the rear into a lounge extension. The main bedroom would be extended over this & a dressing room/ensuite bathroom added. A front dormer would be added to match other similar extensions in the vicinity. The neighbour at 18 The Maltings raised no objections. Cllr Maroney added that it was an attractive design & recommended not objecting.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

Cllr Jordan rejoined the meeting.

#### 49/13.9

**54885**                      **Single-storey extension to rear - 46 Canada Way, Liphook**                      **Mr Cook**  
**Cllr Ms J Kirby**

Cllr Ms Kirby advised that this was a detached property, located in a cul-de-sac. The application was for a single-storey extension to the rear, with a pitched roof, & bricks/tiles to match the existing materials. The existing French doors would be replaced with bi-fold doors & all the new windows/doors would face into the garden, which was large enough to accommodate the extension. The only difficulty would be that access for the contractors would be through the rear garden via a private drive, but this had been agreed.

**Decision:**                      No objections.



52/13

**CERTIFICATES OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT**

**32 Station Rd, Liphook (22871/006)**

It was noted that an application had been made to ascertain whether planning permission was required to use the first-floor for residential use.

**2 Upperfold Cottages, Hewshott Lane, Liphook (32584/006)**

It was noted that an application had been made to ascertain whether planning permission was required for a conservatory at the rear, following the demolition of a porch.

**Naham, Conford Rd, Conford (38042/002)**

It was noted that an application had been made to ascertain whether planning permission was required for two external porches.

53/13

**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY (NPWP)**

Cllr Ms Kirby (NPWP Chairman) reported that the WP had looked at the costs/resources required & grants available to produce a NP. The main requirement was to have the right number of people with the required expertise; unfortunately it always fell to the same people. Another option could be to pay a consultant to write the report. They did however agree that a NP could be useful, particularly for applications such as Bohunt Manor. They concluded that there was no point making a decision about whether to proceed until it was known how many additional houses Liphook would need to accommodate.

54/13

**PLANNING APPLICATION - DURAND ACADEMY BOARDING SCHOOL AT STEDHAM, WEST SUSSEX (SDNPA/13/01358/FUL; 01359/LIS)**

The Chairman reported that the Parish Council had been asked to support Woolbeding & Stedham Parish Councils by objecting to this planning application, which was for a 600-pupil boarding school in Stedham, West Sussex. The pupils would be transported by coach from London via the A3 & Liphook, with around twelve coaches on Sunday evening/Monday morning and return to London on Friday afternoon/Saturday morning. The construction traffic might also go through Liphook.

It was agreed to object to this application on highway grounds (*“Coaches/construction traffic would exacerbate the existing traffic congestion problems in the centre of Liphook & would be inappropriate for the narrow country lanes between Liphook & the proposed school site”*).

**CONCLUSIONS**

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10pm.  
Confirmed at the meeting held on 17 June 2013.

Signed . . . . .  
Presiding Chairman