



# **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 20  
FEBRUARY 2012.**

## **MINUTES**

### **PRESENT WERE:**

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

**16/12**

### **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 had been developments on each of the three major sites in Liphook, namely Bohunt Manor, Lowsley Farm & the OSU site. Further information had been received from G L Hearn, including pre-application sketches of the proposed medical centre at Bohunt Manor, & these would be available from the Parish Office. There was an amendment to the Lowsley Farm application on the agenda (Minute 22/12.7) & the OSU site developments would be covered under Matters Arising (Minute 20/12).

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, 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.

**17/12**

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were none.

- 18/12**            **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**  
Cllr Robinson declared an interest in the Co-operative Retail Services application (Minute 22/12.3) as he lived close to the store.
- 19/12**            **MINUTES OF MEETINGS HELD ON 16 JANUARY 2012 & 6 FEBRUARY 2012**  
These were confirmed & signed as being true records of the meetings.
- 20/12**            **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**  
**16 January 2012** - None.  
**6 February 2012** - Cllr Croucher reported on the 14.2.2012 EHDC OSU Site Forum (Minute 15/12) attended by himself, Cllr Ms Poole & Mr Ellis, following a pre-meeting with two District Councillors. None of them had fully understood the process & had subsequently been sent a letter by EHDC's Mrs Mansi explaining it. It was in fact very constrained as only comments on the current application had been permitted, & the history of the site & previous applications had been deemed not relevant. Mr Ellis had not been allowed to speak, Cllr Croucher had been cut short when he had spoken & he had subsequently written to Mrs Mansi to assert that the Parish Council had not been properly briefed. The developer, Barratts, had given a presentation & the District Councillors had then asked questions, which had flushed out inconsistencies in the Traffic Survey. One key discrepancy was that the model had only included the roundabout near the development, & not the roundabouts in The Square, & when they were included the predicted increase in traffic flow was 250% more. The developer had taken up three-quarters of the meeting & had introduced two alternative proposals which located the Care Home at the rear of the site with two secure units, one of which would be for patients with mental illnesses. After the meeting closed, he had spoken to Mrs Mansi & the two District Councillors, & it had been agreed that he would produce a briefing paper for District Councillors as the Parish Council needed to educate EHDC & the developer that there were not currently any commercial premises for rent in Liphook. Cllr Ms Poole claimed it was disappointing that Barratt's Employment Consultant had dismissed Liphook as a place for employment. Cllr Croucher added that there were likely to be multiple applications, but it was not clear when they would be submitted. It was however clear that the main component would be housing, whereas the Parish Council wanted more employment/parking & fewer houses. It was questionable what the people Liphook would gain from the development as Developers' Contributions had been another taboo subject.
- 21/12**            **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 16/12).

## 22/12.1

**26854/014**                      **Proposed stabling & storage building - Land north of**                      **Mr Renninson**  
**Cllr R Evans**                      **Westering & west of Church Rd, Bramshott**

Cllr Evans advised that the site was adjacent to the slip road to the A3. There was already one barn on the site & this application was for another storage barn. When the previous application was considered, the consensus of opinion was that there was no need for so many barns for such a small field, & the Parish Council had therefore objected.

The meeting was then adjourned for Mrs Kirby (32 Church Rd) to explain that the site was owned by Mr Sellitto, a local builder, who was using the field to store building materials. The original planning permission granted had strict conditions imposed & the owner was trying to slip through a loop-hole by getting Mr Renninson to make this application, which was not valid as one of the conditions was that the land could not be sub-let. The land was not currently being used for equestrian purposes, nor was it any longer fit for such use. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Evans considered that two barns would be excessive & as there was no evidence of horses on the site, he recommended that the Parish Council should object to the application.

Cllr Jordan agreed as he considered that there was no proven need as there was already sufficient stabling.

**Decision:**                      Strongly object as application constitutes over-provision of stables & barns.

## 22/12.2

**27470/013**                      **Two detached dwellings with associated access from**                      **Greenbank Homes**  
**Cllr P Jordan**                      **Tower Close, parking & landscaping - land to the rear**  
   **of 54-58 Headley Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Jordan reported that this was an application for backfill development. In October 2010, there was an application to put three dwellings on the site & the Parish Council had objected as they were concerned about road access, drainage, mass/bulk & loss of trees. EHDC rejected that application & two further applications for two dwellings were made in April/May & in September 2011. The Parish Council objected to both, & both were subsequently withdrawn. This was a third application on the same scheme &, as the Parish Council had objected to the previous two, he would expect to continue to do so. This application included a letter from Hants CC implying that the road could be adopted if various remedial works were carried out, however this would not overcome the narrowness of the road. The application also stated that the footpath to Headley Rd would be retained & Cllr Jordan considered that this should be a condition if permission were to be granted.

The meeting was then adjourned for Mr & Mrs Goldsack (Trudvang, Tower Close) to comment on the application. Mrs Goldsack pointed out that the original application for three houses was based on utilising six back gardens, whereas the applications for two houses only utilised four. Mr Goldsack claimed that recent Government guide-lines stated that garden development should now be treated as a greenfield site, in that any development should not be permitted if it would change the character of the area, which this proposal clearly would as it would include the removal of 24 trees. He was also concerned about damage to the TPO'd Costal Redwood & flooding of the hammerhead. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan stated that the application included an extensive report on the protection of the roots of the retained trees. However, he considered that the site was a green oasis in a densely developed area, & recommended that the Parish Council should object on the same grounds as previously, with the exception of the reference to the loss of the footpath from Tower Close to Headley Rd. This was agreed.

**Decision:**

Object on the following grounds:

1. likely effect on trees, especially Coastal Redwood;
2. plans do not appear to address surface water drainage issues;
3. would alter the character of the area as larger than other surrounding properties;
4. would exasperate existing traffic congestion in this cul-de-sac leading to retirement homes.

However, should permission be granted, request that the footpath to Headley Rd is retained.

Cllr Robinson left the meeting.

**22/12.3**

**27589/014**                      **External chiller/freezer unit & 3-fan air-cooled condenser**                      **The Southern**  
**Cllr Ms Poole**                      **unit to rear with timber fence surround, following removal of**                      **Co-operative**  
**two air-conditioning units - Co-operative Retail Services Ltd,**  
**64 Headley Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole advised that this application was part of the continuing re-development of the Co-op store & would enable the store to carry a greater proportion of frozen food. The applicant had carried out a great deal of work measuring potential noise levels & had concluded that the resultant increase in noise levels would be insignificant. The proposal was to surround the external equipment with 'hit & miss' acoustic fencing to effectively provide a double fence. The equipment was necessary for the store's development so she considered that the Parish Council should not object to the application.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Mr Young (3 The Avenue) to ask whether the proposals would lead to a reduction in parking spaces. Cllr Ms Poole confirmed that this would not encroach on the parking area. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan agreed that the Parish Council should support the application provided that it would not be detrimental to surrounding residents.

**Decision:**

No objections.

Cllr Robinson rejoined the meeting.

**22/12.4**

**27973/001**                      **Two-storey extension to side - 19 Admers Crescent, Liphook**                      **Mr Smith**  
**Cllr P Jordan**

Cllr Jordan reported that this was one of a pair of semi-detached houses & that the proposal was for a two-storey extension to replace an existing single-storey extension. The extension would be the same as the other semi, so this would balance the building. There was sufficient room for the extension & it would not impact on any other houses.

**Decision:**

No objections.

22/12.5

**28040/004**                    **Conversion of garage to habitable accommodation & single**                    **Mr Till**  
**Cllr J Tough**                    **-storey extension to side/rear, incorporating a single garage**  
   **- 15 The Avenue, Liphook**

Cllr Tough reported that this was a quite sizeable house with a double integral garage on the corner of The Avenue & Avenue Close. The proposal was to convert the garage into living accommodation with a new lean-to garage at the side. It would improve the appearance of the house & still allow access to the rear garden between the new garage & the boundary fence. The fence was sufficiently high to prevent any overlooking, so the proposal would be unlikely to affect the neighbour. It would provide self-contained accommodation with access from the rear or through the living quarters of the house.

**Decision:**                    No objections.

22/12.6

**33993/068**                    **New car park island, revised kerb alignment at entrance &**                    **Sainsbury's**  
**Cllr J Tough**                    **loss of one parking space - Sainsbury's, Midhurst Rd,**                    **Supermarkets Ltd**  
   **Liphook**

Cllr Tough explained that if you drive round the car park but do not find a space to park in, & then re-enter the car park, it is currently quite a tight turn to do so. Cllr Evans agreed & had seen an accident there. The proposal was to replace the current ghost island with a raised one, but with more space for the turn which would be achieved at the expense of one parking space. Cllr Tough considered that this would improve safety, especially as the raised island would force cars to stay in their own lane. Cllr Croucher asked whether this would affect the 250 bus; Cllr Tough replied that it would have no impact on the current route.

**Decision:**                    No objections provided does not interfere with the 250 bus service.

22/12.7

**34310/016**                    **Pre-decision amendment - amended highway plans for 155**                    **Easterton Ltd**  
**Cllrs M Croucher**                    **dwelling development - Land at Lowsley Farm, Lark Rise,**  
**/Mrs B Easton**                    **Liphook**

Cllr Croucher reported that the amendment was highly technical with many caveats about the responsibility being passed back to the designers. The bottom line was that the roundabout would be moved further back into the development, & there would be improved traffic calming measures & lower speed limits. Cllr Tough was concerned about the lesser deflection of traffic approaching the roundabout when coming down Longmoor Rd, as they would almost be able to drive straight along it. He considered that it would be better to locate the access to the site through 90 Longmoor Rd, where the emergency access was currently proposed. Cllr Robinson pointed out that the junction would then have to be a T-junction as there would not be room for a roundabout. Cllr Mrs Easton proposed that the Parish Council should continue to object on safety grounds. This was agreed.

**Decision:**                    Continue to object to the roundabout on safety grounds; the roundabout being especially hazardous when approaching it on Longmoor Rd from the centre of Liphook.

22/12.8

**40126/002**                      **Single-storey extension to front - 3 Erles Rd, Liphook**                      **Mr Mason**  
**Cllr Mrs B Easton**

Cllr Mrs Easton advised that this was such a small extension that it would have minimal impact.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

22/12.9

**54042**                      **Single-storey extension to front, alterations to fenestration**                      **Mr Findley**  
**Cllr P Robinson**                      **/doors including enlargement of windows/installation of new**  
**door, removal of porch & chimney, & re-instatement of 2m**  
**high entrance gates - The Oaks, Woolmer Lane, Bramshott**

Cllr Robinson had visited the property, but had been unable to gain access as the premises were unoccupied. The single-storey bungalow dated from the fifties & was of no architectural importance. The application was to add a ground floor bedroom to the front of the property, which would add about 15% to the existing footprint. The other proposed changes to windows/porch appeared to be purely cosmetic, & as the property was in a very large plot shielded by mature hedges/shrubs, the new windows would be unlikely to invade the privacy of neighbouring properties. The only area of concern was the proposal to reinstate 2m high gate-posts as the existing gate-posts formed part of a historic retaining wall bordering several properties along Woolmer Lane. Any changes would need to conform to the construction of this wall, in terms of both use of materials & pointing.

**Decision:**                      No objections provided new gate-posts conform to the construction of the historic retaining wall, in terms of both use of materials & pointing.

## **TREE APPLICATIONS**

22/12.10

**34344/007**                      **Prune oak tree - 47 Shepherds Way, Liphook**                      **Mr Watson**  
**Dr Evans**

Dr Evans explained that the application was for a large oak, probably 80 years old, in the rear garden. The oak was in good health & had been significantly crown-reduced around ten years ago. It looked like a pollarded tree, with spindly branches growing from the previous pruning. The application was to reduce the crown by 20/25%, which would be below the previous pruning, whereas he would recommend it being reduced to the same height as in the previous pruning. The tree currently looked an odd shape, especially without leaves, so it should be an improvement.

**Decision:**                      No objections provided branches only reduced to same height as in previous pruning, rather than a 20/25% reduction.

22/12.11

**49730/001**                    **Fell leylandii & silver birch, & prune tree in rear garden**                    **Mr Jones**  
**Dr Evans**                    **- Tresanton, Bramshott Court, Tunbridge Lane, Bramshott**

Dr Evans reported that there was a large tree, 30/40 ft high, in the rear garden which was overhanging the neighbouring garden. The application was to remove the lowest branch of this tree & Dr Evans had no objections. The leylandii & silver birch were to the side of the house & provided a good screen for Bramshott Court, but tree roots were adversely affecting the sewerage pipe. He had no objection to the removal of the leylandii, but considered that the silver birch should be retained & pruned, & the leylandii should be replaced, in order to retain the screen for Bramshott Court.

**Decision:**                    No objections to pruning of specified branch of tree in rear garden overhanging neighbour's garden, nor to removal of leylandii. However, recommend retention of silver birch & some form of replacement for leylandii, in order to provide screen between this property & Bramshott Court.

**23/12**                    **ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS**

23/12.1

**28922/001**                    **Single-storey extension to side/rear - 9 Hollycombe Close,**                    **Mr Taylor**  
**Cllr P Robinson**                    **Liphook**

Cllr Robinson advised that the dwelling was a mature five-bedroom family house, dating from the thirties with no significant architectural importance. The application was for a single-storey curved extension from the rear of the house to the rear of the single-storey garage. In addition, it was proposed to extend the single-storey garage approximately 2m to the front to match the building-line of the house. The windows of the new extension would not compromise the privacy of the neighbouring properties & the changes would not affect any of the mature trees on the site. The neighbours on both sides were aware of the application & neither had raised any objections.

**Decision:**                    No objections.

23/12.2

**31030/007**                    **Conversion of garage into habitable accommodation to**                    **Mr & Mrs**  
**Cllr Croucher**                    **provide utility room, shower room, cycle & bin store**                    **Smith**  
**- 11 Hunters Chase, Liphook**

Cllr Croucher reported that this was a modern house halfway along Hunters Chase. The application was to convert the garage into habitable accommodation & provide additional car parking space at the front. He could not envisage any problems as other nearby houses had also had the garage converted.

**Decision:**                    No objections.

### 23/12.3

**33125/044**                      **Installation of coiled barbed wire along top of boundary**                      **Mr & Mrs Mellstrom**  
**Cllr Jordan**                      **fence/wall - Woolmer Farm, Woolmer Lane, Bramshott**

Cllr Jordan stated that the proposals were required to enhance the security of the farm. The perimeter comprised three major sections, namely boundary fencing, outward-facing building walls & ten-foot high stone walls, with a short section made up of fence panels above a stone wall. The application was for 600mm barbed wire coils along the outside of the boundary fence, either on galvanised arms or in places along the top of the wall. Cllr Jordan thought that this was probably acceptable to the north & the east, but not when the boundary was with privately-owned land. Discussion followed about the necessity of the measures & the possible dangers to pedestrians & horse-riders. It was agreed to object to the proposed barbed wire fencing.

**Decision:**                      Object to barbed-wire fencing to the south as adjoins other people's private property, & remainder to the north as perceive it to be adjacent to a shared access to neighbouring properties; in particular concerned about danger to any horses/riders.

### 23/12.4

**52120/002**                      **Variation of Condition 13 (variation of plans from**                      **Mr & Mrs Kalinski**  
**Cllr Mrs B Easton**                      **previously granted permission 52120/001) - Radford**  
**Lodge, 72 London Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Mrs Easton explained that the amendment was purely a technicality as the previous plans had been incorrect & this was a re-submission with the correct measurements shown. She added that the house was currently being built.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

### 23/12.5

**54096**                      **Single-storey infill extension to side with three roof-lights**                      **Mr & Mrs Forteath**  
**Cllr P Robinson**                      **& two single-storey extensions to rear/side - Flat 1,**  
**29 Haslemere Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Robinson reported that the application was for single-storey extensions to the ground-floor flat, which would lengthen the existing sitting & garden rooms. The application included three velux windows in the pitched roof to give additional light. The extensions would impact upon the small walled garden, but there would still be sufficient access & there should be no impact on neighbouring properties.

**Decision:**                      No objections.



## TREE APPLICATION

23/12.6

**53904/001**                    **Prune weeping beech & cedar trees - 1 Childerstone Close,        Mr Bray**  
**Dr Evans**                    **Liphook**

Cllr Evans advised that these were beautiful trees, but they were too close to each other. He had no objections to crown-lifting the weeping beech by 5m, nor to pruning any cross-over branches &/or thinning the cedar, but he would object to crown-reducing the cedar as it would ruin the shape of the tree.

**Decision:**                    No objections to crown-lifting beech by 5m, nor to pruning of cross-over branches &/or thinning cedar, but would object to crown-reduction as would ruin the shape.

**24/12**                    **RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)**  
These were noted.

**25/12**                    **SDNPA SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES FUND CELEBRATION (23.3.2012)**  
It was agreed that Cllr Mrs Easton would represent the Parish Council at the celebration (6.30pm for 7pm at Petersfield Festival Hall).

**26/12**                    **EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN: JOINT CORE STRATEGY - PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENT (Appendix 2)**  
It was noted that any representations on grounds of soundness/legal compliance should be made to EHDC Planning Policy Team by 16 March 2012. It was agreed that members would read the 'Summary of the Strategy & Future Role of Liphook' (appended) & advise Mrs Spencer/other members of any representations that they considered should be made.

## CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10.20pm.  
Confirmed at the meeting held on 19 March 2012.

Signed . . . . .  
Presiding Chairman