



# **BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK PARISH COUNCIL**

www.bramshottandliphook-pc.gov.uk

**Mr P J STANLEY**  
**EXECUTIVE OFFICER**  
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 14 APRIL 2014.**

## **MINUTES**

### **PRESENT WERE:**

Cllr D Jerrard (Chairman), Cllr R Evans, Cllr P Jordan, Cllr Ms J Kirby, Cllr Ms J Poole & Cllr P Robinson. Cllr E Trotter, Cllr B Mouland (EHDC) also attended, together with Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden), one member of the press & 13 members of the public for parts of the meeting.

### **38/14 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 advised that there were no members of staff available to clerk the meeting, & that Cllr Robinson would record the decisions.

He reminded members that the topic of the EHDC Community Forum on 15 April was the Joint Core Strategy & local development.

He then explained that the Committee would discuss any applications/other 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.

### **39/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr M Croucher & Cllr T Maroney.

### **40/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

|                                     |   |                                   |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| <b>41/14</b>                        | <b>MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 17 MARCH 2014</b>   |                                   |
|                                     | These were confirmed & signed as being a true record of the meeting.  |                                   |
| <b>42/14</b>                        | <b>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES</b>   |                                   |
|                                     | None.   |                                   |
| <b>43/14</b>                        | <b>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION</b>   |                                   |
|                                     | <u>Public Questions (items not on the agenda).</u>  |                                   |
|                                     | Mr Ellis (21 The Avenue, Liphook) asked whether the board on the fence surrounding the OSU site would be there permanently. Cllr Ms Kirby advised that it would not.  |                                   |
|                                     | <u>Public Participation.</u> Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 38/14).  |                                   |
| <b>44/14</b>                        | <b>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</b>  | <b>APPLICANT</b>                  |
| <b>44/14.1</b>                      |   |                                   |
| <b>21026/042</b><br>Cllr P Jordan   | <b>Two-storey classroom block providing 12 additional teaching spaces with prep room, toilets, office &amp; plant room - Bohunt Community School, Longmoor Rd, Liphook</b>  | <b>Bohunt School &amp; Centre</b> |
| <b><u>Decision:</u></b>             | No objections.  |                                   |
| <b>44/14.2</b>                      |   |                                   |
| <b>21925/016</b><br>Cllr P Robinson | <b>Variation of Condition 8 of 21925/014 to allow substitution of plans to remove dormer window, increase size of remaining dormer window &amp; add small conservation velux roof window - 3 London Rd, Liphook</b> | <b>Arthur Lord Organs Ltd</b>     |
| <b><u>Decision:</u></b>             | No objections.  |                                   |
| <b>44/14.3</b>                      |   |                                   |
| <b>24846/004</b><br>Cllr P Robinson | <b>Single-storey rear extension, following demolition of conservatory - Oak Cottage, Hammer Vale</b>  | <b>Mr &amp; Mrs Gilbert</b>       |
| <b><u>Decision:</u></b>             | No objections.  |                                   |
| <b>44/14.4</b>                      |   |                                   |
| <b>29879/004</b><br>Cllr R Evans    | <b>Construction of double garage &amp; storage with home office above - 82 Headley Rd, Liphook</b>  | <b>Mr &amp; Mrs Norman</b>        |
| <b><u>Decision:</u></b>             | No objections provided conditions imposed to ensure that it cannot be sold off separately.  |                                   |
| <b>44/14.5</b>                      |   |                                   |
| <b>31739/002</b><br>Cllr Ms J Poole | <b>Retention of outbuilding - 98 Headley Rd, Liphook</b>  | <b>Mr Willis</b>                  |
| <b><u>Decision:</u></b>             | No objections.  |                                   |

44/14.6

34310/021  
Cllrs D Jerrard  
/Ms J Kirby

**Change of use of land from agricultural to suitable alternative natural green space (SANGS) - land at Lowsley Farm, Lark Rise, Liphook** Easterton Ltd

**Decision:**

**The Parish Council's comments on this planning application should be read in conjunction with comments submitted for planning application 34310/022.**

1. The applicant states in the submission documents that there is a requirement for 8 Ha of green space provision per 1000 population. As stated in Parish Council's comments relating to application 34310/022, there are overwhelming reasons to retain the current approved SANGS on the north western section of the site. Given that the development is situated in an enclosed area of land between the Longmoor Road, Headley Road and the A3 it is considered that 6.37 Ha of green space is inadequate provision for the number of residents in this area.
2. Referring to the Green Infrastructure Study prepared by East Hampshire District Council, a net loss of over 8.0 Ha from the former King Georges Hospital site which is now a gated community with no public access has been identified. It is our submission that the majority of Field 3 containing the mature oak should be re-allocated as Recreation Space and that negotiation should be carried out with the applicant for allocation of a SANGS on the eastern section of the site.
3. There has been no provision for parking for visitors to the proposed SANGS. Whilst visitors are encouraged to access areas of green space by pedestrian or cycle routes, in reality this is simply not practicable. The War Memorial Ground and Radford Park both have parking areas which are extensively used. If visitors to the proposed green space arrive by car then this would result in unacceptable congestion in the proposed new housing development, in Lark Rise and in The Avenue. These roads have already been identified with traffic problems. The Parish Council could not support an application which is highly likely to exacerbate these problems.

44/14.7

34310/022  
Cllrs D Jerrard  
/Ms J Kirby

**Outline application - phase 1 of 155 dwellings & additional phases for a total of 175 dwellings with associated access, car parking & public open space, following demolition of five dwellings - land at Lowsley Farm, Lark Rise, Liphook** Easterton Ltd

**Decision:**

The Parish Council acknowledge, and indeed the covering letter of this application refers to the fact that the original planning approval for 155 dwellings was on an area to the west of the site which had been identified as a reserve housing site in the Local Plan. In conjunction with this approval (34310/016) an area to the north of the housing allocation was approved as a SANGS. It is therefore unfortunate that reference is made to Phase 1 of a development which implies that there is formal allocation for additional phases of housing development. It is our understanding that the remainder of the site is a SHLAA site and therefore only a

potential housing site with no specific area allocated for housing. This SHLAA site is large enough to accommodate both housing and green space allocation. There are serious concerns about the proposal for housing development particularly on the area currently with approval as a SANGS and these are detailed as follows:

### **Contamination and Flooding**

The area of land which is now the approved SANGS (34310/017) was extensively used for clay extraction for the brick works which was located on part of the approved site for 155 dwellings. It is our understanding that the resulting pit in the central area of the site was infilled with waste from MOD activities and other materials. There is additional contamination from spoil as a result of construction work on the A3 trunk road along the northern boundary, together with spoil from development of the service area alongside the A3 on the north western boundary. There is also a significant area in the approved housing site which is contaminated by asbestos arising from the former brick works. Although the applicant has carried out some borehole tests it is felt that the level of contamination has contributed to the amount of flooding on the site. The amount of flooding is also exacerbated by a number of natural springs on the site.

Although the applicant has undertaken a limited amount of investigation and has proposed measures to limit impact as a result of the contamination and known flooding we do not feel that the applicant has fully addressed Policy P7 in which development will not be permitted “*unless practicable and effective measures are to be taken to treat, contain, remove or control any contamination so as not to (a) expose the occupiers of the development and neighbouring land uses including, in the case of housing, the users of gardens, to unacceptable risk.*” The applicant refers to the level of flooding recently experienced as only being a “once in a 100 years event”. There is no evidence to prove that this may be the case, to the contrary there is greater evidence to show that this will be a continuing trend.

The Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment report also raises a number of concerns. In particular we refer to the results and recommendations in paragraphs 18 onwards. Of the limited number of boreholes used these indicate very high groundwater levels which rise close to the ground surface. The recommendation is that long-term monitoring of boreholes would be required.

Recommendations to alleviate some of the flooding issues include continuous water extraction from trenches which would not be stable during construction; foundation deepening would be required; and shallow soakaways are not appropriate. There are detailed descriptions of extensive measures that would be required to cope with the known flooding issues.

There is no guarantee that the proposed SUDS and drainage systems would contain all of the identified ground water and surface water flooding issues with this proposed development. Roads, drives, roofing, and pathways all add to increased levels of surface water run-off; this is combined with greatly reduced opportunities for excess water to soak into surrounding land with existing high water table levels. Since the present SANGS is on a higher level this means that should flooding occur in the future then the new residents on the currently approved site, together with existing residents along the Longmoor Road, would live in an area of increased flood risk. With alternative areas available for housing development on this site, this is an unacceptable level of risk.

To further illustrate the applicant’s lack of sympathy and understanding of these constraints the proposal (albeit outline only) is for allotments to be provided on

the lowest possible point on the SANGS against a belt of trees with extensive shadowing, leaf fall and root intrusion. These factors combined with poor soil quality means that allotments in this area would be unacceptable to users and certainly to the Parish Council where identified problems would make management unviable.

The total area of the site owned by the applicant is considerable and a proposal to build homes on an area which contains the most extensive level of contamination combined with the greatest risk of flooding is not considered to be the 'best use' of the land available.

### **Noise and Light Pollution**

Whilst noise pollution has been addressed to a degree, there is also the element of additional noise and light pollution for proposed dwellings close to the A3 service station in the north western section of the site. When alternative areas are available for housing it seems inappropriate to propose locating dwellings so close to identified producers of noise and light pollution.

### **Existing SANGS**

The allocation of the existing SANGS related explicitly to the planning approval for the 155 dwellings at Lowsley Farm. Indeed increased housing development removes areas of green space putting further pressure on designated habitats. Whilst there is a proposal to re-site the SANGS to the eastern section of the site, it is essential that reference is made to the original decision to locate a SANGS on the current area. Extracts from the original decision are:

*"The emerging Joint Core Strategy advises that in **Policy CP20 International Designated Sites** that:*

*Any new housing that is proposed to be located within 400m of the Wealden Heaths (Phase 2) SPA will be required to undertake a project specific Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA).*

*... the northern part of the site has been set aside for use as a 3.44 Ha Suitable Area of Natural Green Space (SANGS) ... thereby providing an alternative to the SPA/SAC for residents of the development **and** for residents of Liphook. Lowsley Piece would comprise a mosaic of scrub, grassland and wetland habitats and has been designed ... with guidance provided by the Thames Basins Heaths Delivery Framework, which works on an agreed formula of 8.0 Ha provision per 1000 residents."*

In addition to protection of internationally designated sites **Policy C3** of the Local Plan states that *"Planning permission will not be granted for proposals likely to harm the nature conservation interests of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCS)".* **Policy C4** states that *"Where sites, other than those identified in Policies C2 and C3, have been identified as having local nature conservation interest the Council will have full regard for their scientific significance and nature conservation value when assessing development proposals that may affect those sites."*

The proposed housing development together with the already approved housing would form a continuous boundary against the Griggs Green Farm Woodland (EH0526) SINC which leads by footpath to Griggs Green Copse (EH0527) SINC. It does not take any stretch of the imagination to see that residents would use these two sites as alternative green space as they are within extremely close walking distance. The sites include ancient woodland and high populations of badgers, and Griggs Green Farm Woodland has extensive wetland (boggy) habitats which are becoming increasingly rare. Wetlands are a BAP priority habitat. Not only

would human impact damage these sites and interfere with wildlife, development on the existing SANGS together with creation of SUDS would have an irreversible impact on these fragile ecosystems by dramatically altering the current water levels.

In Section 11.2 of the Green Infrastructure Study, one of the recommendations for Liphook's green infrastructure network is a target of the *creation of a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) by giving statutory status to SINC's where land is of suitable quality and where land owners are in agreement. Proposed development at Liphook (Boyer Planning) includes creation of meadows and scrub which will help deliver this target note.*

Since this area was included in the original application and approval the land owners were indeed in agreement with this proposal at that time. The only conclusion to be drawn from the current proposal is that, even though housing development on this area would require extensive additional remedial work, retaining it as a SANGS provides the opportunity of it becoming a SINC in the near future and thereby giving it statutory status, which in turn would remove the possibility of any further development in the future. Even though there is a proposal for a SANGS on the eastern section of the site this too has no statutory designation and could potentially be put forward for development at a later date.

It is felt that retention of the approved SANGS in the currently approved location would provide an important continuous wildlife corridor, linking the existing SPA/SACs and SINC's, together with the wide hedgerows along the A3 leading on to the River Wey Conservation Areas.

#### **Green Infrastructure Study**

The Parish Council has successfully maintained the Little Rec; War Memorial Ground with its' associated children's play areas, tennis courts, bowling green and football area; and Radford Park with informal open space and River Wey Conservation Area with nature conservation interest. The loss of the King Georges Hospital site for recreation has resulted in increased numbers of dog walkers with associated conflict with other users of these green spaces. These closely linked green spaces form a successful variety of provision meeting the needs of multiple user groups. However with a rapidly increasing population in the settlement there is growing pressure and conflict from the number of people using these spaces and, as identified in the GIS, there is a clear need for a similar mosaic of green space on the north western side of the settlement.

There is a requirement to provide a minimum of 8.0 Ha per 1000 residents and with no other green space within the housing contained between Longmoor Road, Headley Road and the A3 it is imperative that adequate green space is retained both for the residents in this area and in the wider area of Liphook.

It should also be pointed out that the Green Infrastructure Study refers to Open Space Allocations (R4) of the former King Georges Hospital site (8.2 Ha retained as parkland and woodland informal open space). This site was supposed to have been allocated for public recreational use in order to meet existing and future land requirements for recreation activities. This site in its entirety has become part of the gated complex known as Bramshott Place Village. Therefore not only does Liphook have a requirement for additional playing fields, young people's spaces, additional informal openspace, and allotment spaces, to meet the needs of an increasing population, it also requires an additional minimum 8.0 Ha to remedy the loss of the former King Georges Hospital site.

### **Management of the SANGS**

Future management of a SANGS is a major consideration for continued effectiveness. The likely stakeholders in this process would either be the Parish Council, a community group or a formal management team, or potentially a combination of these. There is a rapidly growing community involvement with the management of Radford Park which has seen positive improvements and maintenance of this green space. The Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to become involved in the management of the existing SANGS on Lowsley with the surrounding community.

### **Access and Traffic**

There is still ongoing concern about the siting of the proposed access roundabout for this site. The current proposal is to more than double the amount of dwellings on the site, with the resulting doubling of potential vehicles using the proposed roundabout. This volume of traffic would inevitably add to the Longmoor Road congestion of vehicles accessing the schools, railway station and main shops. There is no detail of how residents will access the proposed new SANGS which is adjacent to The Avenue. There could be greatly increased congestion and parking issues, both within the proposed development and along The Avenue and Lark Rise. This would also give rise to traffic safety issues for schoolchildren at the Liphook Federated School.

There is the wider opportunity to create an access route linking the Longmoor Road to Headley Road, and relocation of allotments with dual purpose parking area. Whilst this is not the appropriate time to debate this, it is strongly felt that whilst the opportunity exists to prepare an overall master plan of the site with all stakeholders then no decision should be made at the present time for piecemeal development proposals on sections of the site.

**Given all the reasons above, this Parish Council strongly objects to the current planning application.**

44/14.8

37296/006

Cllr Ms J Poole

**Decision:**

**Conservatory to rear - 1 Rose Cottage, Hill House Hill,  
Liphook**

No objections.

**Dr Alcott**

44/14.9

38157/005

Cllr R Evans

**Decision:**

**Detached garage - revised scheme from 38157/002 (building  
to be timber rather than masonry) - 2 Primrose Cottages,  
Tunbridge Lane, Bramshott**

No objections.

**Mr & Mrs  
Woods**

44/14.10

53447/002

Cllr P Robinson

**Decision:**

**Side extension to existing garage/outbuilding - Bramshott  
Thatch, Rectory Lane, Bramshott**

No objections.

**Mrs Paterson**



47/14

**TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

**Land at Lowsley Farm, Lark Rise, Liphook (EH 945 - 20.3.2014)**

It was noted that a provisional TPO had been placed on three oaks and two groups of trees (including 16 oaks & one sycamore).

48/14

**BOHUNT MANOR WORKING PARTY**

Cllr P Jordan reported that the remit of the Working Party had been widened to include the proposals for other housing developments in the Parish. The Working Party had held an interesting & informative meeting, but had not as yet been successful in recruiting a technical advisor.

He added that a pre-application submission for development at Bohunt Manor had been submitted to the SDNPA. There was no point in the Parish Council commenting on it at present; it would be better to wait until the SDNPA invited the applicants to submit an outline or full application.

49/14

**SDNP LOCAL PLAN OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

It was agreed that members should attend the EHDC Community Forum meeting on 15 April, & then decide whether or not to submit comments (which were required by 30 April 2014).

**CONCLUSIONS**

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 9.40pm.  
Confirmed at the meeting held on 12 May 2014.

Signed .....  
Presiding Chairman