



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 21 MAY 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 J Tough. Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) & one member of the press also attended, together with three members of the public for part of the meeting.

47/12

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 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.

He advised that an e-mail had been received from Julia Mansi (EHDC Planning Manager) about the processing of applications in the SDNPA area. Only 21 days would be allowed for comments (compared to 28 days allowed by EHDC) & there were currently problems with the SDNPA IT system. He recommended that applications not received within 21 days of a Planning Committee meeting should, at the Chairman's discretion, be considered at Parish Council meetings, or a short Planning Committee meeting held beforehand. He also requested that EHDC should be asked to notify the Parish Council of any SDNPA applications in the Parish until the software issues were resolved.

He reminded members about the HALC meeting on 30 May 2012 for parishes within the SDNPA area & it was agreed that he & Cllrs Mrs Easton/Ms Poole would attend.

He advised members that notification had been received that the Reserved Matters application for the proposed Medical Centre at Bohunt Manor had been submitted to EHDC on 4 May 2012.

48/12

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

49/12

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

50/12

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 16 APRIL 2012

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

51/12

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chairman advised that the Lowsley Farm applications were considered by EHDC on 3 May 2012 & that Cllr Mrs Easton had spoken on behalf of the Parish Council. Cllr Mrs Easton reported that it had been a very long meeting & that both applications (the second for green space land) were considered separately, so there was a great deal of repetition. The officer's recommendation was for permission, based on the precedent set by the Silent Garden appeal decision. Cllr Cowper had recommended that the Committee should ignore this advice & challenge the appeal decision. There were many arguments against the application, but all the points raised were rejected. Objectors included Mr Osborne, who addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents, & Cllr Mouland who also spoke against the application. However, only three of the twelve Committee members voted against the application; the others were too scared to vote against the officer's recommendations.

52/12

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

Public Questions (items not on the agenda).

Mr Trotter (North Cottage, Bohunt Manor) asked why the TPO'd oak tree (which had been felled with permission) had not been replaced (Condition 1 of permission 39366/015/TPO); why development of the allotments had started on the site before the access arrangements were approved (Condition 16 of permission 39366/011); & what had happened about the summons for the trees felled without permission. Cllr Evans replied that he had followed up the first & third issues, but had not received satisfactory responses. It was agreed that a letter should be sent to EHDC, & copied to Mr Trotter, in order to elicit answers to these questions.

Cllr Tough claimed that holly trees had also been felled without permission. Cllr Evans had also contacted EHDC about this & had been advised that they were not protected & that this was considered to be acceptable maintenance.

Cllr Jordan stated that Cllr Mouland was claiming that the Parish Council had not responded to correspondence from the applicant, G L Hearn; a fact that he disputed. He requested that a file of all Bohunt Manor correspondence should be set up. Cllr Jordan added that G L Hearn wanted a forum to be held in order to update the public about current developments at Bohunt Manor, whereas he considered that a forum would only be appropriate once G L Hearn were able to reveal the totality of their plans for the site. The Chairman stated that a Working Party had been set up to deal with this, & that the members were himself & Cllrs Jordan/Mouland. He suggested that the Working Party should meet with G L Hearn & other interested parties, such as the doctors & sports clubs.

Cllr Mrs Easton reminded members that the Parish Council had had a meeting with G L Hearn about a year ago, which quite a few councillors had attended. Cllr Ms Poole added that the Parish Council had also organised a public exhibition about the sports pitches /medical centre applications.

Cllr Tough pointed out that there was nothing to prevent G L Hearn from conducting their own public consultation exercise.

Cllr Mrs Easton had spoken to EHDC & had been advised that the work in connection with the access road was allowed under the permission granted.

Members' / Public Participation (Code of Conduct, Paragraph 12 (2)). None.
Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 47/12).

53/12 PLANNING APPLICATIONS APPLICANT

53/12.1

20313/005 Renewal of extant permission 20313/001 - two-storey Mrs Stuart
Cllr R Evans extension to side, following demolition of garage, stores
& utility room - 64 Shepherds Way, Liphook

Cllr Evans explained that the application was for renewal of an expired permission for an extension, which would improve the property. The extension would make the best use of the space available & the curtilage was large enough to accommodate it.

Decision: No objections.

53/12.2

23288/016 Conversion of ground floor into two residential flats incl Mr Mustafa
Cllr Mrs B Easton a single-storey extension to rear, following demolition of
cold store - Gorselands, Portsmouth Rd, Bramshott Chase

Cllr Mrs Easton reported that this used to be the Little Chef café, but it had been closed since the start of the construction of the A3 Hindhead Tunnel. Various other uses had been considered, but this seemed to be the most practical solution. The upper two floors had been converted into residential flats & the building was originally a private house.

Decision: No objections.

53/12.3

23550/011 Single-storey extension to rear - Retreat Cottage, Passfield Mr Bird
Cllr J Tough Common, Passfield

Cllr Tough advised that this was a well hidden small brick bungalow with open views of the fields beyond. It was accessed by a track from Passfield Common, which ran alongside Cornwall House. The extension would be to the rear & provide a family room. He considered that it was a poor design, but it would not be visible from elsewhere.

Decision: No objections.

53/12.4

27588/004 Two-storey extension to rear, single-storey front entrance Mr & Mrs
Cllr P Jordan hall & detached double garage/workshop to front - Woolmer Bonnar
Gate, Longmoor Rd, Liphook

Cllr Jordan reported that there had been earlier applications for four/six new houses on the site, but this was for an infill extension at the rear. There would be no significant increase to the footprint, no impact on the neighbours & it would make little difference to the appearance of the house.

Decision: No objections.

53/12.5

27589/017 **Display of non-illuminated free-standing totem sign -** **Key 2 Group**
Cllr Ms J Poole **Co-Operative Retail Services Ltd, 64 Headley Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole was concerned about the height of the proposed sign as it would be 4½m tall & could be unstable. It would show a great deal of information, much of which she considered unnecessary.

Cllr Jordan claimed that it was excessive, out-of-proportion to the surrounding area & could be an obstruction/hazard for traffic.

Cllr Mrs Easton felt that it was garish & could set a precedent in the residential area.

Cllrs Tough & Croucher both agreed that it was too large, & unnecessary.

Decision: Object as consider sign unnecessary & too large/out-of-keeping for residential area. Would also set a precedent & could create a highway hazard as could obscure drivers' vision.

53/12.6

34147/005 **Conservatory to rear - 2 Holmehills Cottages, Conford Rd,** **Mr Green**
Cllr J Tough **Conford**

Cllr Tough advised that the property was at the far end of Conford, beyond the ford. There had been an earlier application for a larger conservatory, which had been refused because of its size. The neighbours objected to this application as they would have a direct view into the conservatory from their bedroom & their bedroom would also be seen from the conservatory. They would accept it if it had a tiled roof, rather than a glass one, but that might not be a practical option. Cllr Tough thought that it was too high & would breach the 50% rule.

A vote was taken (four in favour of objecting; two against).

Decision: Object as too large & would result in loss of privacy for neighbour at 1 Holmehills, as their bedroom window would look into the conservatory & vice versa.

53/12.7

35815/003 **Detached stable block - Burgh Hill Farm, Burgh Hill Rd,** **Mr Matthews**
Cllr J Tough **Bramshott**

Cllr Tough explained that the site backed onto the bridleway to Bramshott Court. It was very tidy & there was already a barn/stable there. This application was for a second stable which would form a stable yard. The site was not visible from anywhere other than the bridleway, so he could see no reason to object, particularly as it would replace a building destroyed by storm damage in 1989.

Cllr Evans had also visited the site & spoken to a neighbour, who had claimed that the barn/stable were under-utilised & could see no reason for an additional stable. He was also concerned that the previous application was for a bungalow on the site.

Cllr Jordan asked whether there was adequate land for the stable. Cllr Tough considered that there was & that the location, adjacent to an extensive bridleway network, was ideal for a stable yard.

Cllr Evans argued that it would constitute excessive development in the countryside.

A vote was taken (three in favour of objecting; four against).

Decision: No objections.

53/12.8

38634/003 **Change of use of land to rear to residential curtilage - The** **Mr Wright**
Cllr P Jordan **Beeches, 1 Ottawa Drive & 2 & 6 Ottawa Drive, Liphook**

Cllr Jordan reported that the hedge was 8/10 ft high & divided the area between Chiltlee Manor Estate & Sainsbury's/Ottawa Drive. There was a strip of land behind the hedge at the end of the Ottawa Drive gardens which the applicants claimed to own. This application was to move the hedge to the other side of this strip, thus incorporating the strip into the gardens, for three of the six gardens, which were not all adjacent to each other. There had been similar applications for all six houses in 2004, which had been rejected as the beech hedge was seen as a natural barrier & its retention was one of the conditions of the original OSU site planning permission. Some trees had already been removed from the hedge at No 6, effectively incorporating the land into the garden. The other three houses used the land to store their recycling bins. Residents of Chiltlee Manor Estate objected to the application as it would result in a zigzag hedge & would remove their privacy. Cllr Jordan recommended objecting as it would be contrary to one of the original planning conditions & it would not be practical to replace a mature hedge as it would need many years to grow sufficiently.

The meeting was then adjourned for Ms Doubtfire (Chiltlee Manor Residents Association) to comment on the application. She had attended the Planning Committee meeting in 2004 when the earlier application had been made. Her main concern was that granting permission would set a precedent for other residents in Ottawa Drive &, more worryingly Sainsbury's, who could gain additional land & save the cost of cutting the hedge. She added that the hedge provided a visual & acoustic barrier, & her understanding was that the land was still owned by the MOD. The meeting was then reconvened. It was agreed to object to the application, citing the 2004 objections, the zigzag fence-line & the precedent issue as the grounds for objecting.

Decision: Object to change of use as want MOD land to remain as amenity land/buffer zone between Chiltlee Manor Estate & the houses in Ottawa Drive, as in the original planning conditions for the OSU site, in order to ensure the privacy & security of the occupants of both Ottawa Drive & Chiltlee Manor Estate. This would also break up the fence-line & set a precedent.

NB. The occupants of 6 Ottawa Drive have contravened the original planning conditions by removing some of the hedge & incorporating the amenity land into their garden.

53/12.9

39060/012 **Replacement dwelling, following demolition of existing,** **Mrs Seaton**
Cllr M Croucher **associated access, parking & landscaping - 46 Chiltley**
Lane, Liphook

Cllr Croucher reported that there was outline permission for two dwellings on the site. The Parish Council had already seen the detailed application for the first dwelling & had not objected to it, & this application was very similar.

Decision: No objections.

53/12.10

50374 **Conversion of single-storey dwelling to two-storey with** **Mr Hogan**
Cllr Mrs B Easton **raised roof-line, including extensions to front/rear & triple**
detached garage with external staircase to first-floor
- Lowood, Upper Hammer Lane, Bramshott Chase

Cllr Mrs Easton reported that this was a small bungalow on the edge of the Parish & the application was to convert it to a two-storey five bedroom house with a three-bay garage. She considered that the house would be too big for the plot & it would constitute over-development in the countryside /Conservation Area. It would be very close to the road, although it would be hidden by a large hedge from the road & neighbours.

Cllr Jordan commented that there were many other large houses in the area. Cllr Mrs Easton stated that the adjacent dwelling was a chalet bungalow.

Cllr Tough considered that it was too large for the plot.

The Chairman pointed out that permitting the application would lead to a reduction in the number of smaller houses in the countryside.

Decision: Object as constitutes over-development in the countryside - would like to maintain the mix of rural housing stock.

53/12.11

Pre-application **Proposed redevelopment of existing telecommunications mast** **Vodafone Ltd**
Cllr M Croucher **station base - Liphook Railway Station, Station Rd, Liphook** **/Telefónica UK Ltd**

Cllr Croucher reported that the MOD were making it difficult for Orange to maintain an existing mast site. They were therefore planning to share the existing mast at Liphook Railway Station. This would effectively provide four masts in one, which would mean that other masts could be dismantled. This was in accordance with government policy, & obviously beneficial for the Parish.

Decision: No objections.

TREE APPLICATION

53/12.12

35579/008 **Fell fir tree - 7 Goldenfields Close, Liphook** **Mrs Banks**
Dr Evans

Dr Evans was unable to attend the meeting, but had submitted a report which was read out to members. The tree was in the front garden, to the left of the house. It was about 25ft tall & the roots were growing towards the house & into the foundations. The tree was quite dense & was blocking light into the lounge & bedroom. It was an ornamental tree, planted many years ago, which had just kept growing & growing. Dr Evans recommended agreeing to the request, with the caveat that a small ornamental tree should be planted in its place.

Decision: No objections provided small ornamental replacement tree planted.

54/12 **ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS**

There were none.

55/12 **RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)**

These were noted.

56/12 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

Pine Lodge, Longmoor Rd, Liphook (E.H. 886 - 6.10.2011)

It was noted that a provisional TPO on a spruce in the rear garden had been confirmed without modification on 1 May 2012.

Rear of 58 Headley Rd/SE boundary of Trudvang, Tower Close, Liphook (E.H. 889 - 28.11.2011)

It was noted that a provisional TPO on a group of eight trees (four Lawson Cypress, two Sweet Chestnut, one Ash & one Coastal Redwood) on the south-east boundary of Trudvang (which replaced earlier TPO (E.H. 887 - 20.10.2011), as original TPO showed trees in incorrect location) had been confirmed without modification on 10 May 2012.

57/12 EARLY DAY MOTION ON PLANNING APPEALS

It was noted that, following a request NALC & consultation with members, a letter of support had been sent to the Rt Hon Damian Hinds MP (see Appendix 2).

58/12 FORMER OSU SITE, MIDHURST RD, LIPHOOK

Cllr Mrs Easton advised members that, following complaints about the appearance of the site, she had contacted the Enforcement Officer at EHDC to request that they take action to get the site cleared up. However, this could not be done & the advice given was that the Parish Council should write directly to the owner of the site, who she understood was Deep Harbour Properties Ltd. Cllr Jordan suggested that the letter from the Parish Council should offer to arrange for volunteers to tidy the site, should the owners be unwilling to do so. This was agreed.

59/12 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING - 17.4.2012 COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING

Cllr Tough reported on the meeting (see Appendix 3). He was concerned that if the Parish Council were to produce a Neighbourhood Plan, it would involve taking on a great deal of work which was currently done by the Planning Authority, & for which there was unlikely to be sufficient funding. He explained that the Parish Council did not have to accept this responsibility, & if it did, the Plan would be subject to referendum. The Chairman considered that the Parish Council should explore whether there were resources to produce a Neighbourhood Plan, as doing so could be beneficial. Cllr Tough recommended that the Parish Council should support the completion of the Parish Plan. This was agreed.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10.20pm. Confirmed at the meeting held on 18 June 2012.

Signed
Presiding Chairman