



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 TUESDAY 3 MAY 2011.

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs A James (Chairman), Cllr Mrs B Easton & Cllr Ms J Poole. Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden) & Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) also attended, together with one member of the press & six members of the public.

47/11 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/SDNPA.

48/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr R Evans, Cllr P Jordan, Cllr Dr S Judge & Cllr P Wilson.

49/11 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 11 APRIL 2011

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

50/11 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were none, however Cllr Ms Poole asked that it be noted that there was an error in the minutes of the meeting of 21 March 2011: her report about the application for 30 London Rd should have read "... *the only concern raised was about proximity to/overlooking of 30A (not 34) London Rd*" (Minute 29/11.2).

51/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman read out the Declaration & asked whether members had any interests to declare. 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.

52/11 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 47/11).

53/11 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

APPLICANT

53/11.1

20675/011 Cllr Mrs B Easton	Two-storey extension to side & first-floor extension over pool room & replacement pool roof - Three Firs Cottage, Bramshott Chase Rd, Liphook	Mr & Mrs Neale
--	--	---------------------------

Cllr Mrs Easton reported that this was a very large house near the A3, & outside the settlement boundary. The application was for an infill extension at the rear & to change the roof over the swimming pool. The property had originally been a small house, with a floor area of around 120 sq m. It had been extended seven times since 1975 & now had a floor area of 622 sq m; the proposed extension would add a further 112 sq m. The application claimed that Policy H16 (50% rule) had been breached so many times that there was no reason to object. Cllr Mrs Easton agreed & stated that there was no valid planning reason to object.

Decision: No objections as Policy H16 (50% rule) has already been breached many times.

53/11.2

27470/011 Cllr Mrs A James	Three detached dwellings with garages & access onto Tower Close - land rear of 50 - 58 Headley Rd, Liphook	Greenbank Homes
---	---	------------------------

The Chairman reminded members that the Parish Council had seen a very similar application for this site in November last year & had objected as it constituted over-development of the site. The proposed houses would all have four bedrooms & two bathrooms, & were very large compared to the other houses in Tower Close. The application claimed that there was a market requirement for the houses & that the proposed houses reflected the nearby development of Childerstone Close. The application was not dissimilar to the previous one, although there had been some minor changes, in particular an odd roofline in order to accommodate the large number of bedrooms & bathrooms, which had resulted in a poor design. Also, in this application all the houses had integral garages. There would still be a requirement for the felling of some trees, although quite a few were to be kept but these were likely to ruin the amenity of the gardens for the future occupants, & would therefore be under future threat.

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

Firstly, Mr Goldsack (Trudvang, Tower Close) claimed that there were currently around 23 trees on the site & as only eight were listed as being “possibly retained”, this would totally change the character of the road. He also claimed that the application was misleading as the consent granted in 2004 had now expired & the photograph of Tower Close, with just one parked car, was not at all representative. He could not understand why the application had been resubmitted as he did not consider that it overcame the earlier reasons for refusal.

Mr Casperd (Marlow House, Tower Close) stated that his earlier objections concerning traffic congestion, pedestrian safety & lack of parking had been ignored as there had been no reference to them in EHDC's reasons for refusal. The Chairman replied that the previous refusal had covered highway safety & lack of on-site parking, but traffic congestion was not an issue for EHDC as it was the responsibility of the County Council Highway Engineers.

Mr Poke (Stonewood, Tower Close) voiced concerns about the loss of the hammerhead, the loss of on-street parking & flooding.

Mr Goldsack added that the foundations of the house on Plot 1 would encroach into the root protection area of the Coastal Redwood (tree 16), that the house on Plot 3 would be over the roots of the TPO'd oak (tree 12) & that drainage option B would include a sewer that would run within 1m of two Sweet chestnut trees in his front garden.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Decision:

Strongly object on the following grounds:

1. over-development of site;
2. scale/size of dwellings out-of-keeping with nearby dwellings (NB. this site is not comparable with Childerstone Close);
3. would exasperate existing traffic congestion in a cul-de-sac which leads to Greenbank Nursing Home & other retirement homes;
4. in order to accommodate four bedrooms & two bathrooms, the design of these properties is unacceptable, especially the roof angles & dormer windows;
5. inadequate footpath, possibly resulting in loss of the Coastal Redwood (tree 16);
6. hardstanding for the three houses would exasperate existing flooding problems to properties opposite the site ;
7. grave concerns re: the retention of trees on whole site as the foundations would be too close to roots of trees, especially the TPO'd oak tree (tree 12);
8. the future of the trees to be (possibly) retained is not secure as the trees would be detrimental to the amenities of the future occupants of these three houses &, in particular, fear the loss of the TPO'd oak tree (tree 12) & the Coastal Redwood (tree 16);
9. inadequate visibility splay for property on Plot 1 due to the Coastal Redwood (tree 16);
10. this is not now a brownfield site.

53/11.3

29867/003

Cllr Ms J Poole

Single storey extension to front and rear, enlarged dormer to rear and alterations to fenestration - 44 London Rd, Liphook

Mr & Mrs Warr

Cllr Ms Poole advised that the proposal was to extend both the ground & first floors, & that the Parish Council had seen a similar application last December. One of the neighbours had voiced concerns about the original application, & so the applicant had withdrawn it & made various amendments to alter the orientation of the windows in order to prevent any overlooking. She had spoken to the neighbours on both sides & neither had any objections to this amended application.

Decision:

No objections.

33993/067

Cllr Mrs A James

**Renewal of extant outline permission 33993/063 -
development comprising 49 retirement apartments,
51 close living apartments, nursing home, 24 affordable
housing units, 4 key- worker flats & B1 business units &
a 20 space station car park
- former OSU site, Midhurst Rd, Liphook**

**Deep Harbour
Properties Ltd**

The Chairman reminded members that the Parish Council had strongly objected to the original application in 2007 as it was mostly residential on a site which had been earmarked for employment use. EHDC had refused permission, however the applicant had appealed & the appeal had been allowed. This was no different to the original application; the only changes were that Liphook had been elevated to a District Centre in the emerging Core Strategy & the retirement developments at the King George Hospital site & at the corner of Tower Rd/London Rd had now been built, but were not fully occupied.

Decision:

Strongly object to this application on the following grounds:

1. does not meet the needs set out by the Local Plan Inspector, namely that the site should be for employment usage only;
2. object to the considerable amount of proposed residential properties, which are not required;
3. object to the lack of marketing of the site (a number of inquiries have been made & all have been rejected);
4. object to the loss of the last employment site for the newly designated (in the emerging Core Strategy) District Centre of Liphook (the opening of the Hindhead Tunnel later in 2011 will be very advantageous, especially as site is in close proximity to the rail station);
5. wish to see the balance of the entire OSU site retained, as originally planned;
6. wish to see expanded health facilities & youth facilities on this site;
7. no immediate requirement for retirement facilities, given the recent developments of 155 retirement units at the King George's Hospital site & 27 retirement units at junction of Tower Rd/London Rd.

TREE APPLICATION

53456 **Crown-lift to 5m & crown-reduce by 20% two oak trees & Mr Wilde**
Dr M Evans **remove lower horizontal limb from one of them**
 - 4 The Warren, Passfield

Dr Evans explained that The Warren was a small development of four houses built in the car park of the former Passfield Oak public house. The trees were quite visible from the road & could therefore be deemed to be amenity trees. T1 was around 80 years old & in rather poor health, whereas T2 was considerably older & was a magnificent specimen with a full canopy. The reasons given for the application were to allow more light into the garden & to reduce the overhang over the garage. Dr Evans considered that the application for work to T1 was valid & that the proposed work should benefit the tree. However, he could not see any justification for the proposed work to T2 & would recommend just tip-pruning the branches towards the garage. He considered that the amenity value of T2 was very important, especially given the poor health of both T1 & the nearby Passfield Oak.

Decision: No objections to proposed work to T1, however strongly object to any work to T2 (apart from tip-pruning the branches towards the garage) as this is a magnificent, healthy amenity tree of particular importance, as it is likely that both the Passfield Oak & T1 will be lost in due course.

54/11 ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS

There were none.

55/11 RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)

These were noted.

56/11 DEVELOPMENT - KING EDWARD VII HOSPITAL SITE

The Chairman explained that the Parish Council had received a letter from Haslemere Town Council (see Appendix 2), requesting Parish Council support for their objection to the proposed 400 house development on this site. Cllr Mrs Easton asked whether there was a railway station in Midhurst. The Chairman replied that there was not, & agreed that the residents of this development could well add to Liphook's traffic congestion & parking problems should they come to Liphook to either use the railway station or access the A3. It was agreed that the Parish Council should support Haslemere Town Council & the Committee would recommend that the Parish Council Chairman should sign the objection letter.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 9.05pm.
 Confirmed at the meeting held on 23 May 2011.

Signed
 Presiding Chairman