



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
JULY 2011.**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr D Jerrard (Chairman), Cllr M Croucher, Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr R Evans, Cllr Ms J Poole & Cllr P Robinson. Dr Evans (Parish Tree Warden), Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) also attended, together with one member of the press & twelve members of the public for part of the meeting.

80/11 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.

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.

81/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

82/11 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 20 JUNE 2011

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

83/11 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were none.

84/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Two declarations were made:

- Cllr Jerrard declared a personal & prejudicial interest in the EHDC site visit to Old Thorns Golf & Country Club, Weavers Down as he had objected to the original application & had subsequently had his membership terminated (Minute 91/11);
- Cllr Robinson declared a personal & prejudicial interest in the application for 65 Headley Rd, Liphook as the applicant lived opposite him & was a friend of his (Minute 86/11.7).

85/11 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

Public Questions (items not on the agenda).

Firstly, Mr McArdle (57 Portsmouth Rd, Liphook) expressed concern about excavations for a slip road & car park at Bohunt Manor, & asked whether the funding for the proposed medical centre & playing fields had been secured. The Chairman advised that this should be covered in Item 10 (Minute 90/11).

Mr Trotter (North Cottage, Bohunt Manor) asked what was happening about the oak tree to the rear of the Parish Office. Mrs Spencer advised that the felling of the tree was an agenda item for 25 July Parish Council meeting.

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

Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 80/11).

86/11 PLANNING APPLICATIONS APPLICANT

86/11.1

20744/009 Cllr M Croucher	Single-storey extension to rear & porch to front (following demolition of conservatory & front extension), re-render house & garage - Riverside House, Tunbridge Lane, Bramshott	Mr & Mrs Wallace
--	---	-----------------------------

Cllr Croucher advised that this was one of three modern brick detached houses, probably built in the 1980’s or 90’s. The proposal involved removing the front extension to allow access to the side of the property. The work would have a slight impact on one neighbour, who was not in when Cllr Croucher visited the site. He considered that it was a reasonable application, which would improve the appearance of the house & be in-keeping with the surrounding houses.

Decision: No objections.

86/11.2

21925/012 /013 Cllr M Croucher	Two-storey building for shop/office use together with alteration & restoration of existing barn, following demolition of single-storey shop - 3 London Rd, Liphook	Arthur Lord Organs Ltd
---	---	-------------------------------

Cllr Croucher reported that the site was in the Conservation Area, opposite the HSBC bank. The applicant had just purchased the site & the proposal was to refurbish the whole site, including making the barn look more like a barn. He added that the appearance from the road would be vastly different due to the increased height, but similar to adjacent properties, & a significant improvement. His only concern was a large bicycle shed in the car park at the rear which he considered should be removed in order to facilitate additional on-site parking.

Decision: No objections provided bicycle shed removed in order to provide additional on-site parking.

86/11.3

22115/026 **Display of non-illuminated wall-mounted entrance sign** **R T Warren**
/027 **& 2.12m high wall at entrance to estate to hold title sign** **(Investments) Ltd**
Cllr Mrs B Easton - Beaver Industrial Estate, Midhurst Rd, Liphook

Cllr Mrs Easton reported that the applications were for a new curved wall with an integral sign. She considered that it would both improve the appearance of the entrance & help lorry drivers find the Industrial Estate. All members agreed that it would be an improvement as the current entrance was rather ugly.

Decision: No objections.

86/11.4

23717/013 **Retention & continued display of two flagpoles, one** **McCarthy & Stone**
Cllr R Evans **non-illuminated directional sign, two non-illuminated** **Retirement**
 board signs & one canopy - 15 Tower Rd, Liphook **Lifestyles Ltd**

Cllr Evans explained that McCarthy & Stone had failed to sell all the retirement homes & so wanted to retain their flags & other marketing signage. He advised that he was fairly neutral about whether the Parish Council should object or not. Cllr Croucher claimed that it was a bit of an eyesore. Cllr Robinson had no objection to the flags, but considered that the signage was just advertising. It was agreed to object as the materials had already been on display for at least two years.

Decision: Object as consider that applicant has had sufficient time to
 advertise the site.

86/11.5

23966/010 **Single-storey extension to rear - Nutbourne, Hazeldene Rd,** **Mrs Clarke**
Cllr Ms J Poole **Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole explained that the extension was to provide additional space for the kitchen & dining area. The neighbours had no objection to the extension, but were concerned about the three windows which would overlook their garden. Removing the windows should not create a problem as there were also velux windows in the pitched roof.

Decision: No objections provided that the three windows which overlook the
 adjacent property, Middle Earth, are removed.

86/11.6

25868/001 **Car port to rear on parking area - 14 Haslemere Rd,** **Mr Holland**
Cllr Mrs B Easton **Liphook**

Cllr Mrs Easton reported that the site backed onto the Midhurst Rd car park. Earlier permission had been granted for an archway in the wall between the rear gardens & the car park to facilitate a communal area for cars to turn so that they could enter the car park in forward gear. The proposal was for the applicant to erect a car port on the existing parking area at the bottom of their garden. It would be constructed of traditional materials, in-keeping with the Conservation Area. Cllr Mrs Easton's only concern was whether it would block the access gate to the rear garden of 12 Haslemere Rd.

Decision: No objections provided that the car port does not obstruct access to
 the rear gate of 12 Haslemere Rd.

Cllr Robinson left the meeting.

86/11.7

29992/006 **Single-storey extension, including double garage to side,** **Mr Prosser &**
Cllr R Evans **following demolition of conservatory - 65 Headley Rd,** **& Ms Hall**
 Liphook

Cllr Evans explained that the application was to extend the kitchen, demolish the existing conservatory & add a garage with a pitched roof. It would all be in-keeping & none of the neighbours had any objections. Cllr Croucher asked about the area in the roof of the garage. Cllr Evans replied that it would just house a small storage area.

Decision: No objections.

Cllr Robinson rejoined the meeting.

86/11.8

50018 **Single-storey extension to side/rear - 1 Thorncroft Villa,** **Mrs Inward**
Cllr P Robinson **Conford Rd, Conford**

Cllr Robinson had discussed the application with the applicant & could see no reason to object as it would not interfere with any boundaries, trees or hedges, & the materials would be sympathetic with the existing structure.

Decision: No objections.

86/11.9

52153/004 **Two-storey extension to side, single-storey extension to rear,** **Mr Stronge**
Cllr Ms J Poole **dormer window to rear to facilitate conversion of roof space,**
 following demolition of car port & partial demolition of cottage
 - Vernon Cottage, Hazeldene Rd, Liphook

Cllr Ms Poole explained that this application should be considered with two others for the site, which were on the agenda as additional applications (Minutes 87/11.2 & 3). She reported that this was similar to a previous application, which the Parish Council had considered in July last year. The Parish Council had objected to the additional new dwelling as it was too close to the adjacent property, 2 St George Cottages, & there had been concerns about drainage. However, EHDC had granted permission. This was an amendment to that original application & work was in progress, with both the demolition & the detached garage at the rear being completed. The proposal was to modify the existing cottage & build a smaller twin next to it. This would increase the accommodation in the original cottage by spreading it over three floors: ground, first & attic. The smaller twin would have a similar arrangement, also over three floors, designed to match Vernon Cottage. She considered this to be a slight improvement on the original application as the new cottage would not be as close to the neighbouring property.

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

Firstly, Mr Popple (Flint Cottage, Hazeldene Rd) stated that he lived directly opposite the site. He objected to the current plans as, although the buildings would be tidier, the velux windows on the third floor of both cottages would directly overlook his bedroom & back garden.

Mr Dixon (Heatherview, Hazeldene Rd) was concerned about surface water drainage, which he claimed was not mentioned in the application. He argued that that the original application with the new cottage set at an angle, further back into the site, was preferable as it would both improve the drainage & privacy issues, allow more light into the adjacent property & provide a turning space at the front of the property. The applicant, Mr Stronge, replied that there would be adequate turning space at the side of each property & that, as the sunlight came from the rear, setting the cottage further back would reduce the light. Mr Dixon argued that daylight, not sunlight, was the issue.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Croucher stated that he would not support the applications as he considered that the applicant should have submitted one application covering all the proposed work, & that the overall effect of all the applications was to increase the total volume. The Chairman agreed that all three applications should be considered together. Cllr Croucher proposed objecting to both this application, & to the application for the new dwelling, & requesting that, should the new dwelling be allowed it should be set back. He had no objections to the other application as it was for a new garage for a permitted dwelling. A vote was taken & all were in favour.

Decision: Object as the cumulative footprint of this dwelling plus that of proposed new dwelling (52153/005) is significantly larger than that of earlier permission (52153).

86/11.10

53214 Single-storey extension to rear - 22 Admers Crescent, Liphook Mr Wheeler Cllr P Robinson

Cllr Robinson had discussed the application with the applicant & had obtained clarification of the positioning of the proposed extension in relation to an existing single-storey extension at the adjacent property, 21 Admers Crescent. Although both extensions would have parallel walls either side of the boundary, they would be at least 30cms apart. He had been advised that the neighbour was aware of the application & had raised no objections.

Decision: No objections.

86/11.11

53355/001 Retention of timber shed to rear - 25 The Avenue, Liphook Mrs Arnold Cllr R Evans

Cllr Evans stated that construction of this 'shed' had already started, & it was massive, around half the size of the house & more like a log cabin than a shed. It was intended to be used to store motorbikes, but the applicant had a garage which could be used for this purpose. He had spoken to Mr Allgood, the neighbour who would be most affected, & he objected to the application.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Mr Allgood (23 The Avenue) to comment. He was concerned about motorbike noise, especially as the building faced onto his conservatory, & raised concerns about the size of the building, the number of motorbikes it could house, its potential use as a workshop & the PVC glazing/patio doors. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Evans stated that it could set a precedent & recommended objecting on the grounds of size, detrimental to neighbours & likely noise nuisance. All members were in agreement.

Decision: Object as too large, too intrusive to amenities of adjacent property, 23 The Avenue, & likely to create noise nuisance.

86/11.12

53543 **Change of use of first-floor offices to residential flat, first-floor** **Mr Blower**
Cllr M Croucher **extension to side & infilling of courtyard for improved A1 &**
 B1 uses - Map House, 6b The Square, Liphook

Cllr Croucher explained that the proposal was to infill the whole of the outside area & incorporate the barbers & Inwood Stoves, in order to provide retail units/offices on the ground floor & residential accommodation above. He added that there was a large parking area at the rear with permission for a garage; however any cars exiting the site had to cross the pavement. Cllr Robinson pointed out that this would lead to an increase in traffic on a busy road in the Conservation Area. Cllr Croucher agreed. He stated that he could not support losing small office space in order to gain additional residential space & recommended objecting. This was agreed.

Decision: Object for the following reasons:

- loss of a small B1 office unit;
- over-development in centre of Conservation Area;
- extra residential unit likely to generate additional traffic which has to cross the footway to access the highway - a busy road between two mini-roundabouts.

86/11.13

53557 **Pre-decision amendment - two-storey extension to rear** **Mr Evamy**
Cllr Ms J Poole **- 44 Admers Crescent, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole reminded members that the Parish Council had not objected to the original application. The amendment was just to provide confirmation that building materials would be stored on site, rather than on the highway. She had spoken to the neighbour, who had no objections.

Decision: No objections.

TREE APPLICATIONS

86/11.14

38284/004 **Crown reduce & lift oak & two sycamores in rear garden** **Mrs Bonser**
Dr Evans **- 11 Childerstone Close, Liphook**

Dr Evans claimed that these were important amenity trees, particularly as they were the only ones in the immediate vicinity. There had been an earlier application to fell these trees & the Parish Council had objected. The trees were 40-50ft tall & to crown reduce them would ruin their amenity value, whereas crown lifting would only affect the view from a few surrounding houses.

Decision: Object to crown-reduction as would result in loss of amenity value, but no objections to crown-lifting.

86/11.15

49617/002 **Crown reduce two lime trees - 11 Tunbridge Crescent,** **Mrs Derham**
Dr Evans **Liphook**

Dr Evans explained that the application had been made by an adjacent neighbour, rather than by the owner. The Parish Council had objected to an earlier application to fell these trees. He claimed that the proposed work would reduce the trees to half their current height & destroy their amenity value.

Decision: Object as would destroy amenity value of the trees.

87/11 **ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS**

87/11.1

30331/002 **Attached garage - 8 Greenfield Close, Liphook** **Mr Sadler**
Cllr P Robinson

Cllr Robinson had spoken to the applicant & could see no reason to object. The entrance to the property would need to be relocated, but this was unlikely to affect any trees & the applicant was aware that the kerb stones would need to be replaced when the existing entrance was closed.

Decision: No objections.

87/11.2

52153/003 **Detached garage/store to rear - Vernon Cottage, Hazeldene** **Mr Stronge**
Cllr Ms J Poole **Rd, Liphook**

This application was considered earlier in the meeting with the application for extensions at Vernon Cottage (see Minute 86/11.9).

Decision: No objections.

87/11.3

52153/005 **Detached dwelling with garage/store to rear - Vernon** **Mr Stronge**
Cllr Ms J Poole **Cottage, Hazeldene Rd, Liphook**

This application was also considered earlier in the meeting with the application for extensions at Vernon Cottage (see Minute 86/11.9).

Decision: Object for the following reasons:

- cumulative footprint of this new dwelling plus existing dwelling (52153/004) is significantly larger than that of the earlier permission (52153);
- over-development of the site;
- no proven need for new house;
- privacy issues - the velux windows would overlook house /garden of Flint Cottage, the house on the opposite side of Hazeldene Rd.

However, should permission be granted, the dwelling should be set further back into the plot in order to alleviate drainage problems & allow more light into the adjacent property, 2 St George Cottages.

TREE APPLICATIONS

87/11.4

31925/009 **Prune holly, hemlock & two oaks - Anvil Cottage, Hammer** **Mr Pegley**
Dr Evans **Vale**

Dr Evans advised that the cottage was situated down the track opposite the Prince of Wales public house. He considered that none of the proposed work would be detrimental to the trees & that, in fact, the proposed crown lifting of the hemlock would balance the tree & improve its appearance.

Decision: No objections.

87/11.5

37512/006 **Fell a group of 16 leylandii trees - The Old Mill, Tunbridge** **Mr Wilson**
Dr Evans **Lane, Bramshott**

Dr Evans explained that the leylandii had originally been planted to screen an oil container, but they had now grown much too big & were rather straggly. The proposal was to replace them with native trees, which would be an improvement.

Decision: No objections.

88/11 **PLANNING APPEAL**
46 Chitley Lane, Liphook (39060/008)

It was noted that an appeal by Mrs Seaton (re: refusal of planning permission for a replacement access & closure of two access points) had been allowed.

89/11 **RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)**

These were noted.

90/11 **BOHUNT MANOR, PORTSMOUTH RD, LIPHOOK (39366/011)**

The Chairman explained that he had added this to the agenda as a number of parishioners had raised concerns about parts of the site being cleared. He explained that the developer was putting in the access road/splays in accordance with the planning permission for sports pitches & allotments which had been granted last year. The Parish Council had received a letter from the land owner's agent, GL Hearn, which had been copied to all Parish Councillors. The letter confirmed that the applicant was making a material start on the construction works associated with the planning permission & provided assurances that the work conducted was in accordance with the approved plans. It also invited the Parish Council to enter into dialogue with the land owner & expressed a desire to work with the local community to deliver facilities for the village. He added that there was a concern that now the site was in the SDNP, should the permission lapse, it might be harder to gain permission. 'Word on the street' was that the financing for the proposed pitches, allotments & medical centre had not been secured & if this was the case, it was obviously of great concern.

The meeting was then reconvened to allow members of the public to speak.

Firstly, Mr Trotter (North Cottage, Bohunt Manor) showed members photographs of the excavations for the allotments car park. He considered that the area was far too large, particularly if the developer did not proceed with provision of the allotments.

Mr McArdle (57 Portsmouth Rd) queried the need for a second road access to the site. Mr Trotter replied that, now IML were using the site, the original access onto Portsmouth Rd had been found to be inadequate & hazardous for the volume of traffic. Mr McArdle added that he was concerned as the site appeared to be being prepared for major development.

Mrs Afrikan (57 Portsmouth Rd) claimed that there was no purpose building a large roundabout & access road if there was no funding available. She also added that DEFRA requirements for preservation of hedgerows had not been adhered to.

There followed further discussion about the trees which were damaged/felled earlier this year.

The meeting was then reconvened.

The Chairman suggested that the Parish Council should hold a Planning Forum meeting in due course for parishioners to discuss these issues. Cllr Mrs Easton agreed. Cllr Evans suggested also inviting representatives from EHDC, SDNPA & the developer, & promoting it on the Parish Council website. Cllr Croucher recommended referring the developer to the Parish Plan Group.

Cllr Robinson considered that the Parish Council should request EHDC to check whether the work conducted was in accordance with the permission granted. This was agreed.

91/11 EHDC SITE VISIT

Old Thorns Golf & Country Club, Weavers Down, Liphook (21589/076)

It was agreed that Cllrs Croucher & Robinson would represent the Parish Council at the site visit (9.30am Friday 22 July 2011) re: an application for a detached building for 51 hotel apartments with a mezzanine floor within the roof space (revision to permission 21589/070).

92/11 CONSULTATION - SDNPA STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

It was agreed to delegate the authority to Cllrs Jerrard & Evans to complete the questionnaire on behalf of the Parish Council (questionnaire to be submitted by 15 August 2011). The completed questionnaire was to be circulated to all members in due course.

93/11 CONSULTATION - PLANNING FOR TRAVELLER SITES

It was agreed to delegate the authority to Cllr Jerrard to complete the questionnaire on behalf of the Parish Council (with input from other members by 25 July; questionnaire to be submitted by 3 August 2011). The completed questionnaire was to be circulated to all Parish Councillors in due course.

94/11 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ACT 2007/2010 - PLANNING POLICY /GUIDANCE TO APPLY TO MAJOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

The proposals put forward by Leiston-cum-Sizewell TC/SALC (outlined in Appendix 2) were discussed & it was agreed that a response to offer full support should be sent.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 11.10pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 22 August 2011.

Signed
Presiding Chairman