



# **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 17 JANUARY 2011.**

## **MINUTES**

### **PRESENT WERE:**

Cllr Mrs A James (Chairman), Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr R Evans, Cllr P Jordan (for part of the meeting), Cllr Dr S Judge, Cllr N Newman & Cllr Ms J Poole. Cllr Mrs E Hope (EHDC), Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) & one member of the press also attended, together with 21 members of the public for parts of the meeting.

### **01/11 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.

She then explained that the Committee would discuss any applications 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 & then the meeting would be reconvened for the Committee to agree their comments for submission to EHDC.

### **02/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr P Wilson & Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden).

### **03/11 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 13 DECEMBER 2010**

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

### **04/11 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

There were none.

**05/11            DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman read out the Declaration & asked whether members had any interests to declare. The following declarations were made:

- Cllr Newman declared a personal & prejudicial interest in the additional application for Five Oaks, Queens Rd, Liphook as the site was adjacent to his property (Minute 08/11);
- the Chairman declared that, as a District Councillor, she reserved the right to express opinions at District-level based on all the information received & put before the South Planning Committee, whereas at this meeting she would be acting solely as a Parish Councillor.

**06/11            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 (see Minute 01/11).

**07/11            PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**APPLICANT**

**07/11.1**

**21539/005**

**Change of use of paddock to residential curtilage - Bell House, Limes Close, Bramshott**

**Mr & Mrs Cruickshank**

Cllr Newman reported that the previous application had been to include the whole of the paddock area into the garden, & the Parish Council had objected as it was such a large area of land & could set a precedent. The present application was to incorporate a much smaller area of the paddock. He had visited the site & agreed that the garden did seem too small for the house, but it had been like that when the house had been bought. Some of the local residents had concerns about the application; however some of this was due to confusion over how much of the paddock would be incorporated. They considered that, if the application was permitted, there should be stipulations to ensure that there were no leylandii hedges & no garden paraphernalia, such as sheds, in the incorporated area.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow the agent, Mr White (Genesis Town Planning), to explain that the house had been built in 2004 & the previous owner had incorporated the paddock area into the garden by mowing it. There was no visible boundary to show where the garden ended & where the paddock began. His client had bought the house in 2009 & wanted to regulate the situation. This application was to incorporate a much smaller area of the paddock, 84% less than the previous application, & introduce a definable boundary. The Parish Council were understandably concerned about the application setting a precedent, but now planning guidance had been changed this should no longer be an issue. He added that the land was under potential enforcement & that his client would work with the Enforcement Officer to find a boundary solution acceptable to neighbours. He added that EHDC could enforce an Article 4 Direction on the land, which would remove the permitted development rights. The meeting was then reconvened.

**Decision:**

No objection to the change of use of the specified part of the paddock to domestic curtilage, but request that conditions are imposed to prevent the erection of any structures on it in order to avoid urbanising agricultural paddock land.

## 07/11.2

**22095/015**                      **Variation of Condition 18 of permission 22095/014 to**                      **Anwick Homes**  
**Cllr N Newman**              **allow a close-boarded fence in place of approved brick**  
   **- 6 Headley Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Newman stated that he was surprised that an application was needed as the fence in question was not a boundary fence & could not be seen from outside the site. It divided the rear gardens from the communal parking area & the intention was to replace a proposed brick wall with a close-boarded wooden fence to match the approved boundary fences.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

## 07/11.3

**22702/034**                      **Internal refurbishment of cellar/ground/first floor, new**                      **Greene King**  
   **/035**                              **finish to existing patio & redecoration of exterior - Royal**  
**Cllr Mrs A James**              **Anchor, 9-11 Portsmouth Rd, Liphook**

The Chairman explained that as the pub was a listed building permission was needed to redecorate it. The proposals were to convert the first-floor into three flats for employees, to re-carpet & paint the downstairs & redecorate the exterior. She was pleased that the applicant wanted to improve the building & considered that the proposed works would enhance it.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

## 07/11.4

**25198/009**                      **Three-storey extension to existing dwelling to allow revised**                      **Mr Wickham**  
**Cllr P Jordan**                      **layout of the two existing dwellings, plus two new carports**  
   **- 1 Chase Villas, Seven Thorns Lane, Bramshott Chase**

Cllr Jordan reminded members that the site was on the A3, beyond the Mercedes Garage. The building was semi-detached & had been divided into two large flats. There had been an earlier application to extend the property & add a detached double garage. The Parish Council had not objected, but EHDC had refused permission on a technicality, namely that the extension would be greater than 50% of the original in a restrictive policy area. This application was still for a fairly major development on the side & two car ports; however he could not see that any other use could be made of the land due to the close proximity to the A3. Cllr Jordan recommended not objecting to the application, & leaving it to EHDC to check that it complied with their policy.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

## 07/11.5

**26854/010**                      **Retention of stables & storage building (amendment to**                      **Mr Sellitto**  
**Cllr N Newman**              **previously approved scheme 26854/006) - land north of**  
**Westering & west of Church Rd, Bramshott**

Cllr Newman reported that permission had originally been sought for a large barn & separate stables, & then for a significantly smaller combined building. The latter had been granted permission & construction had commenced, however the size & materials were not in accordance with the permission granted & were much more in-keeping with a house than a barn, & included a balcony. The applicant had then submitted a retrospective application to retain the constructed building, & the Parish Council had objected. EHDC had refused permission & stopped the construction. The applicant had now submitted amended plans which reduced the three stables to two & reduced the ridge height. There would be two large double doors at the front of the building & it would be far more attractive, but would still be much larger than the original permission.

**Decision:**                      Appreciate the removal of one stable & the reduction in height,  
but object to the width & depth of the storage barn.  
However, should permission be granted request that conditions  
are imposed to prevent residential use at any time in the future.

## 07/11.6

**27500/014**                      **Conversion of out-building to ancillary residential**                      **Mrs Perring-Evans**  
**Cllr Mrs B Easton**              **accommodation - Passfield Farm, Passfield Rd, Passfield**

Cllr Mrs Easton explained that an application was required as the out-buildings were in the curtilage of the main house which was a Grade II listed building. In 1998 consent had been given to convert some out-buildings into offices & ancillary residential accommodation. Extra accommodation was now required & hence this application had been submitted to convert further out-buildings as it would not be possible to extend the main house.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

## 07/11.7

**31567/009**                      **Two-storey extension to side, first-floor extension to the**                      **Mrs Dance**  
**Cllr Mrs B Easton**              **south-east & dormer windows to front - Hurlands, Gentles**  
**Lane, Passfield**

Cllr Mrs Easton reported that a certificate of lawfulness for proposed single-storey extensions had been permitted, but the applicant was now submitting an application for a very large two-storey extension which would almost double the size of the house. She considered that the Parish Council should object as this would make the house too large.

**Decision:**                      Object to the increased size & bulk which would result from these  
extensions.

## 07/11.8

**32379/001**                      **First-floor extension to rear - 124 Haslemere Rd, Liphook**                      **Mr & Mrs**  
**Cllr R Evans**                      **Evans**

Cllr Evans reported that the house had already had a single-storey extension at the rear & this was an application to build on this at the first-floor level. It would be an improvement as the building would be flush at the rear & the neighbours did not object.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

07/11.9

**39060/008**                      **Replacement access & closure of two access points**                      **Mrs Seaton**  
**Cllr N Newman**                      **- 46 Chiltley Lane, Liphook**

Cllr Newman reminded members that there had been at least eight applications on the site & that the Parish Council had always objected as a new access would ruin the character of the sunken lane. Unfortunately, the applicant had started work without permission on the weekend & had removed some shrubs & top soil from the bank. This was witnessed, photographed & reported to EHDC by Mr Taylor (Chiltley Lane Action Group). As a result, the Enforcement Officer had visited the site, work had been stopped & the bank had been partially restored. The meeting was then adjourned to allow Mr Taylor to request that the Parish Council write to EHDC to ask that the bank be restored to its previous condition. The Chairman agreed to do so. Cllr Newman thanked Mr Taylor for his vigilance & actions, & the meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Newman recommended that the Parish Council should continue to object to this application for the same reasons as before. This was agreed.

**Decision:**                      Strongly object to the creation of a new access in this sunken lane as no proven need. Previous refusals for this site have centred on the fact that the creation of a new access would destroy the character of the sunken lane, due to the visibility splays required & the removal of substantial hedgerows.

07/11.10

**39366/017**                      **Amendment - Gospel Hall & associated access, parking & landscaping - Bohunt Manor, Portsmouth Rd, Liphook**                      **South Downs Gospel Hall Trust**  
**Cllr P Jordan**

Cllr Jordan reminded members that the Parish Council had considered the original application in November 2010 & had objected to it for a number of reasons. The applicant had now submitted various amendments to the application in order to try & overcome the objections raised by both the Parish Council & the SDNP Authority. The amendments comprised a reduction in the amount of hard surfacing in the car parking area & access lane, additional landscaping & the replacement of the 4m lamp-posts around the edge of the site with 1m bollards. The amended plans also included addendums to the Flood Risk Assessment & the Alternative Site Search Report. Documentation included in the amended plans argued against each of the six objections raised by the Parish Council, in particular it claimed that the existing Brethern were not catered for (but made no reference to the newly opened Gospel Hall at Camelsdale), the site already had permission for various community uses such as sports pitches, allotments & a medical centre (although these would be used by 90% of the community, rather than by a minority), the lighting would only be on for two or three hours a week in winter months when the Hall was in use & the site was on the edge of the SDNP, was not in the AONB prior to the Park's designation & was an 'urban fringe transition area'. When the original application was discussed, Cllr Jordan had also been concerned about the impact on traffic & he advised that the report by Highways & Transport East considered that the parking provision was inadequate & claimed that the application was premature as the plans for the roundabout had not been finalised.

The meeting was then adjourned for members of the public to speak.

Firstly, Mr Meech (110 Haslemere Rd) complained that insufficient notice had been given for the public consultation; the Parish Council had written to EHDC about this & Mr Meech was not satisfied with the reply received. He objected to the application as the site was in the SDNP.

Mr Trotter (North Cottage, Bohunt Manor) claimed that the Chairman had supported the original application & asked whether there was any link between this application & the funding for the sports pitches, allotments & medical centre. The Chairman replied that she had not supported the application; it was the Parish Council's reasons for objecting that she did not support. She stated that this was a

totally separate application & that the meetings in connection with the other applications did not include the Gospel Hall applicants & that there was an officer of the Council present at all meetings. Mr Trotter also asked whether objections to the original application would still stand; the Chairman replied that they would, however it was always advisable to re-iterate them.

Mr Jerrard (Coach House, Greatham) asked whether the officers were from the District or Parish Council & whether the meetings were minuted. The Chairman replied that at some meetings EHDC officers had been present, & at others Parish Council officers attended; pre-application meetings were not minuted, but the consultations involving the Parish Council Recreation Committee had been. She added that the Parish Council had not submitted the planning applications as it was the responsibility of the land owners & their agents to obtain the change of use permission.

Mr Knappett (SDGHT) spoke on behalf of the applicants. He claimed that three or four separate advertisements had been placed in the Liphook Herald two to three weeks prior to the consultation, as well as posters in shops. He confirmed that the SDGHT had not funded the other applications in any way. He argued that there was a local need for the Gospel Hall as the Fernhurst Hall was oversubscribed to a dangerous extent & claimed that the application had been supported verbally by people who attended other churches in Liphook. SDGHT was a charity & needed to provide a place of worship where everybody would be welcome. He stated that the existing regular congregation in Liphook & the surrounding villages supported the local shops as 80-90% of the households came into Liphook at least once a week to shop. He added that a previous Parish Councillor, Mr Walters, had advised that the site was actively being promoted for public/community use & that the SDGHT had spent a great deal of time & money producing this application.

Mr Feeney (37 Portsmouth Rd) asked several questions about the location of the site, in relation to the settlement boundary & the SDNP. He claimed that the design was poor & that an S.106 agreement would be appropriate as the Hall would not generate a gain for the wider community.

Mr Trotter was concerned about noise pollution; singing from inside & rain/hail drumming on the steel roof.

Mr Futchter (6 Field Place) had objected to the original application on the grounds of over-development & considered that these amendments did nothing to address this.

Cllr Jordan claimed that the people of Liphook could not understand the need for such a large hall, especially as there was a large hall at Horndean. Mr Knappett replied that the hall would be needed once every year/two years to encompass Brethren from elsewhere, whereas the hall at Horndean would fulfil this role for the Horndean Brethren.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan proposed that the Parish Council should object & listed reasons for objecting/conditions to be imposed should permission be granted. A vote was taken (For: 5; Against: 0; Abstentions: 2).

**Decision:**

Object on the following grounds:

1. excessive bulk & mass in area outside the settlement zone & inside the SDNP;
2. design out-of-keeping with the rural setting;
3. would not service the needs of the wider Parish community as would be closed to only 24 members of that community;
4. do not want Bohunt Manor to become a site of 'urban fringe development' or an 'urban fringe transition area';
5. would set a precedent for further non-essential need development on this open space asset to the community;
6. insufficient time allowed for public consultation;
7. parking provision not sufficient to prevent on-street parking & traffic, at times of maximum movement, would be burden to existing traffic;
8. gross over-development of site.





Cllr Newman left the meeting.

**08/11                    ADDITIONAL APPLICATION**

**26780/011                    New utility/day room for ancillary use to an existing gypsy     Mr Searle  
Cllr Mrs A James     site - Five Oaks, Queens Rd, Liphook**

The Chairman reported that earlier applications for a detached dwelling in 2001 & certificate of lawfulness to use as a permanent dwelling in 2006 had both been refused. The site had permission for two static caravans & one touring caravan. New Gypsy Guidance permitted a brick-built utility room & this application had been submitted for a utility room to serve three pitches. However the site only housed two, as the touring caravan would not be eligible, & the proposed utility block did not look at all utilitarian; it would be exceptionally large & spacious, incorporating a living room with a fireplace, a porch & large roof void.

**Decision:**                    Strongly object to the size & the building materials. Also strongly object to the porch, chimney, fireplace & large living space - none of which are necessary for a utility room.

Cllr Newman re-joined the meeting.

**09/11                    RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)**

These were noted.

**10/11                    CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT**

**Knock Hundred Cottage, Portsmouth Rd, Bramshott Chase (52676/001)**

It was noted that an application had been made to ascertain whether planning permission was required for a two-storey extension to the rear & a single-storey extension to the side.

**11/11                    TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

**Land north of 99 Headley Rd, Liphook (EH 852)**

It was noted that the provisional TPO placed on three oaks on the eastern boundary, adjacent to Headley Rd, had been confirmed without modification.

**CONCLUSIONS**

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10.10pm.  
Confirmed at the meeting held on 21 February 2011.

Signed . . . . .  
Presiding Chairman