



BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK PARISH COUNCIL

www.bramshottandliphook-pc.gov.uk

Mr P J STANLEY
PARISH 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
FEBRUARY 2013.**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr D Jerrard (Chairman), Cllr M Croucher, Cllr P Jordan, Cllr Ms J Kirby, Cllr T Maroney & Cllr Ms J Poole. Cllrs Mrs A Glass, Mrs L Ashton, B Mouland (EHDC), Cllr E Trotter & Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) also attended, together with six members of the public for parts of the meeting.

13/13 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/SDNP.

14/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

15/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

16/13 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 14 JANUARY 2013

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

17/13 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chairman advised that it had been agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party (Minute 12/13) should report to the Planning Committee, rather than to Full Council. However, as this meeting had a particularly long agenda, the Working Party would report to the next Parish Council meeting.

18/13 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION
Public Questions (items not on the agenda). None.
Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 13/13).

19/13 PLANNING APPLICATIONS APPLICANT

19/13.1

**SDNP/12/03176 Community farm building - Bohunt Manor Barn, Portsmouth Green Village
/FUL Rd, Liphook Investments
Cllr M Croucher (GVI)**

Cllr Croucher reminded members that the Parish Council had seen the original application last year, when the barn had been in a different location, further into the site, beyond the proposed allotments. The original permission for the allotments included a large car park & the proposal was now to locate the barn adjacent to this car park, so that the ploholders could park, collect their tools & walk to their plots with their tools. Cllr Croucher considered that it was a better location in terms of impact on the countryside, however the Parish Council had been concerned about the use of the barn as it was not included in the original application. The appearance was quite acceptable; it was a typical wooden barn. The application stated that it would be for communal use, as well as for storage of tools, & made reference to picnic/barbeque areas and the orchards.

The meeting was adjourned to allow Cllr Trotter to point out that the barn would be clearly visible from Portsmouth Rd as it would be 5.4m high & there were already six sheds on the allotment site for the storage of tools. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan disputed the 'community' terminology; he claimed that it was misleading as the community were not involved. He added that the Parish Council had found the terms of the original agreement onerous. He considered that ploholders would prefer sheds to the proposed barn. He added that he had always been sceptical about the distance from the car park to the plots as it would not be practical, and concluded that there was no proven need for the barn.

The Chairman read out the Parish Council's original concerns & proposed that the Parish Council should object on the same grounds. Cllr Jordan considered that reference should also be made to the size of the barn, the view from Portsmouth Rd & the fact that there was no proven need. This was agreed.

Decision:

Object on the following grounds:

1. outline application for allotments (39366/011) made no mention of any buildings connected with the allotment site;
2. land now part of SDNP;
3. no mention of financial arrangements nor who would be responsible for the supervision, management, maintenance and security of this site/buildings, which are described as 'village/community facilities';
4. building too large &, in particular, too high;
5. would spoil view from Portsmouth Rd;
6. currently there are no allotments/ploholders, therefore no proven need.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Cllr Mrs Glass to explain that the plans were identical to the earlier application, which had been given permission, but they had now found a drain, not shown on the earlier plans, & therefore had had to re-submit the plans. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan recommended continuing to object for the same reasons as before, apart from the reference to changing the character of the Berg Estate which he did not consider to be valid. A vote was taken (all in favour apart from Cllr Maroney, who abstained as he disagreed about objecting to the loss of light).

Decision: Object on the following grounds:
1. over-development;
2. loss of light to adjacent house, 4 Willow Gardens;
3. loss of privacy for adjacent house, 4 Willow Gardens.

19/13.5

29238/016 Retention of outdoor learning & activity equipment Churcher's College
Cllr M Croucher - Churcher's College Junior School, Midhurst Rd, Liphook College

Cllr Croucher explained that previously permission had been granted for a limited period as there was concern about the close proximity to residential properties. The Parish Council had not objected before & he was not aware of any objections, so Cllr Croucher recommended not objecting to the permission being renewed.

Decision: No objections.

19/13.6

33993/071; 072 Employment use comprising mix of A2, B1C & B1A, together Taylor Wimpey
Cllrs P Jordan with new access (outline application) + Residential development UK Ltd & Stax
/M Croucher comprising 62 dwellings with associated access, parking & Development Ltd
open space - former OSU site Area B, Midhurst Rd, Liphook

Cllr Jordan reminded members of the planning history of the site. The original Development Brief identified the whole 7,500 sq. m site for employment use. An outline application for a mixed use scheme, including a nursing home & retirement apartments, was submitted in October 2007. EHDC refused permission, but this was challenged & overturned at appeal in July 2008, as the Inspector considered Liphook to have a localised economy & did not support the Local Plan policy that required the whole of the site to be designated for employment use. In June 2011 an extension of time application was granted, so that the permission remained live. Since then Barratt's had presented a mixed scheme for consultation, which comprised 58 dwellings & a care home, although no application was actually submitted. In July 2012 Taylor Wimpey submitted applications for 67 dwellings & a care facility; the Parish Council objected & EHDC refused permission, mainly due to the unwarranted loss of land designated for employment use.

The current application comprised a full application for 62 dwellings, none of which would be affordable, & an outline application for 2,200 sq. m of commercial floor space. The make-up of the commercial floor space would be dependent on the uptake of the B1a units. The residential parking would satisfy current standards & provide 135 spaces in a mix of garages, driveways & parking courts. The employment area would provide a further 58 spaces. The applicant argued that it would not be financially viable to include affordable housing, but should the commercial element not come forward affordable housing could be provided in lieu of it. The Local Plan required land to be safeguarded for parking for the railway station, but this was not included in this scheme as it was argued that the commercial area included a large area of car parking which could be utilised for commuters. Cllr Jordan pointed out that spaces were usually available in the existing station car park as many commuters chose to park in local side streets to avoid paying the parking charges.

Cllr Jordan referred to EHDC's Joint Core Strategy document, which concluded that the provision of further dwellings in the parish would be satisfied by some 600 dwellings already approved, including the 127 dwellings on this site approved by the Inspector in 2007. Should the latter not go-ahead, it was possible that alternative land could be required for development & the only land so far identified by developers was Bohunt Manor, with outline plans for 250 dwellings in January 2010. The Joint Core Strategy was currently under review, following the Government Inspector's decision that it would not provide sufficient housing for the area, & there was therefore a risk that, should the OSU site not be developed, further pressure would be put on Liphook to provide additional sites.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow EHDC councillors to comment on the applications.

Firstly, Cllr Moulard advised that the applicant had been in discussion with the Planning Officer who was challenging the lack of affordable housing; these negotiations were expected to take a couple of weeks to complete. Cllr Ms Kirby pointed out that this was an ideal location for affordable housing as it was within walking distance of the shops, station & schools.

Cllr Maroney claimed that the entrance to the Beaver Industrial Estate was dangerous as there was a very poor sight-line; he considered that the entrance to this site would have the same problem.

Cllr Moulard advised that the applicant was offering a much lower level of developer contribution than normal, as they claimed that this was all they could afford.

Cllr Ms Poole stated that the site should be promoted as an employment site. Cllr Ms Kirby pointed out that commercial vehicles associated with an employment site could create further traffic problems in the centre of Liphook.

Cllr Jordan was concerned that, should the Parish Council insist on a full employment site, the site might never be developed. He considered that this mixed use would be the right solution if affordable housing were to be included. Cllr Croucher argued that the view had always been that this would be an employment site. Cllr Maroney considered that having commercial vehicles travelling to employment sites in the middle of towns was not acceptable.

Cllr Mrs Glass advised that the proposal was for office buildings with retail outlets underneath, hence the reason for being situated on Midhurst Rd.

Cllr Moulard added that there were land ownership problems which prevented the site being accessed from the Beaver Industrial Estate.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan supported the concept of mixed development, but wanted affordable housing even if it was at the expense of commercial development. Cllr Croucher agreed, but considered that the affordable housing should be located with the rest of the housing.

Cllr Ms Kirby considered that the employment allocation had already been reduced & that it should not be further reduced; she claimed that the affordable housing should come from the housing allocation.

Cllr Maroney was concerned about the lack of parking & the lack of affordable housing. He considered that restrictions should be imposed to prevent on-street parking, which would result in the demand for more parking spaces.

Cllr Jordan proposed supporting the applications provided some of the proposed dwellings were replaced by affordable housing. This was agreed.

Decision: Support the applications provided some of the residential dwellings are replaced by affordable housing.

19/13.7

34693/014 **Variation of Condition 6 of 34693/010 - to allow substitution** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr T Maroney **of plans regarding elevation details - Boland Springs,** **Redrupp**
 Hewshott Lane, Liphook

Cllr Maroney reported that there was already permission to demolish the existing house & replace it with a large, attractive five-bedroom dormer bungalow. The applicants now wanted to change the size of the two rear dormers so that they opened onto balconies. They also wanted to add a balcony to the west elevation, adjust the ridgeline of the small pitched roof above the front/rear central doors & replace one front window with two tall narrow ones. Cllr Maroney had no objections as the proposed changes would improve the appearance & would not affect the amenities of neighbouring houses.

Decision: No objections.

19/13.8

35179/006 **Removal of Condition 5 of 35179/002 to allow garage to be** **Mr Prisgrove**
Cllr P Jordan **used as habitable accommodation, plus single-storey extension**
 to front of garage - Cherry Tree Cottage, Hammer Vale

Cllr Jordan explained that the site was past the Prince of Wales public house & adjacent to a track off Hewshott Lane. The proposal was to extend the garage to incorporate an en-suite bathroom for an adjacent bedroom. He could not envisage any problems as the en-suite would have no external windows, so would be invisible from outside, & the nearest neighbour was the other side of the track.

Decision: No objections.

19/13.9

36945/004 **Single-storey extension to side - Alderwood Cottage,** **Mr Newman**
Cllr T Maroney **Queens Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Maroney advised that the site was at the end of Queens Rd, near the A3. The site had been split in two; with the smaller part containing the existing small bungalow & the larger part a mobile home. A previous permission to replace the bungalow with a two-storey house had a condition imposed to prevent the plot being split. However, as that permission had expired, the condition was no longer in place. Cllr Maroney considered that the small proposed extension was not unreasonable for the reduced plot size. The existing bungalow was a combination of brick/timber-cladding & the extension would also be part brick/part timber-cladding. The extension would, however, be better from an aesthetic & durability perspective if it were entirely brick. He could see no reason to object provided the legality of splitting the plot was valid.

The meeting was adjourned to allow the applicant to explain that there had been a minor misunderstanding with the architect, who had submitted the plans with a brick exterior, rather than a timber finish. The meeting was then reconvened.

Decision: No objections provided the legality of splitting the plot is valid.

19/13.10

50374/001 **Amendment - receipt of bat survey - conversion of single-storey dwelling to two-storey with raised roof-line, including dormer windows to front & rear, following demolition of utility room & detached double garage - Lowood, Upper Hammer Lane, Bramshott Chase** **Mr Hogan**
Cllr Ms J Kirby

Cllr Ms Kirby reported that an extensive bat survey had been conducted, which concluded that there was no evidence of either roosting features or bats. There was a very large garden with many trees & she considered that, if there were any bats in the area, they would be more likely to use the trees than the house. The property was a modest three-bedroom bungalow, set in a dip, & needed modernising. The property would retain the same footprint with a raised roof to accommodate bedrooms. The conversion would result in a four-bedroom house with a much better layout. She considered that it would be a huge improvement & had no concerns provided that any security lighting was at a low level.

Decision: No objections provided any security lighting is low-level.

19/13.11

50448/001 **Conservatory to rear - 31 Lark Rise, Liphook** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr Ms J Poole **Holmes**

Cllr Ms Poole reported that the conservatory would not affect anyone, except possibly the neighbours at 53 Lark Rise, but they had no objections. It would be very similar to many other conservatories in Lark Rise.

Decision: No objections.

19/13.12

51890 **Insertion of new bedroom window on SW elevation - Flat 6, Mr Sellitto**
Cllr Ms J Poole **31 Haslemere Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole advised that Flat 6 was a first-floor flat & the bedroom currently had one window. The bedroom of the flat below also had only one window, but had permission for a second one to be added. This application was for a second window for Flat 6's bedroom, which would mirror that of the flat below. She claimed that the additional window might affect the amenities of 29 Haslemere Rd, as it appeared that it could look into one of the windows.

Cllr Maroney considered that the Parish Council should object if a habitable room was overlooked, especially as the bedroom in Flat 6 already had one window. This was agreed.

Decision: Object if new window does, as appears likely, provide a view into the neighbouring property, 29 Haslemere Rd.

19/13.13

52747/005 **Re-submission of 52747/003 - change of use from agricultural** **Mr Keet**
Cllrs D Jerrard **land to mixed use for keeping of horses, siting of two stable**
/M Croucher **blocks, stationing of caravans for occupation by single gypsy**
 family, with associated hard standing, septic tank, utility room
 & retrospective alterations to site access - Hilltop Stables, Devils
 Lane, Liphook

Cllr Croucher had visited the site with the Chairman & spoken to the applicant about the previous access problems. The access splay was now much larger &, in particular, there was now a reasonable view to the left when exiting the site. The downside was, however, that more of the hedge had been removed, making the site more visible from the lane. The applicant was using the Gypsy Act to support the application & Cllr Croucher considered that the most pertinent question was whether the applicant was actually a gypsy. He added that the applicant claimed that he was, but it would be up to the Planning Authority to validate the claim.

The Chairman claimed that the original application had been contentious & a group of local residents had opposed it. It had eventually been refused on highway grounds & gone to appeal. There was some dispute over where the boundary to the site lay, in relation to the road. The only planning objection had now been removed; however the application could possibly be turned down if a better site was available, but there was not one at present.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Cllr Mouland to speak. He advised that the recommendation was to grant permission as the Keet family appeared to have satisfied the Gypsy Policy requirements. Permission would be granted to the existing family of seven Keets. He added that Chichester DC had rejected a similar application, but that was probably as the site was within the SDNP.

Cllr Jordan queried the size of the area released from agricultural use. The Chairman replied that it was just the marked site, not the whole field. Cllr Croucher claimed that it was around a third of the field.

Cllr Jordan quoted an example of a gypsy site in Queens Rd, where the site had had to expand as the family expanded. Cllr Croucher advised that the application already included a utility room & septic tank, so this would not be an issue.

Cllr Mouland read out the EHDC Officer's recommendations for the Planning Committee meeting on 21 February & advised that three objections had been received to-date.

Cllr Croucher recommended that the Parish Council should press for a three-year permission as EHDC were looking to set up a permanent site in the District & this would give some level of control. Cllr Jordan added that the Parish Council should also ask for diagrams to clearly mark/measure the dimensions so that the site did not expand. This was agreed & the meeting was reconvened.

It was agreed that Cllr Croucher should represent the Parish Council at the EHDC Planning Committee meeting on 21 February.

Decision: Permission should be restricted to a three-year temporary permission, so that the family could be relocated should a permanent gypsy site be set up within the District. Also request that the precise dimensions of the site are recorded on the plans & specified in the permission.

19/13.14

53881/002 **Conversion of barn to dwelling, after demolition of stable** **Mr Watkins**
Cllr P Jordan **buildings - Glebe House, Rectory Lane, Bramshott**

Cllr Jordan advised that the Parish Council had considered this application in October last year & had not objected. However, EHDC had refused permission as the application did not demonstrate that the proposal would not harm protected species or that uses other than a domestic dwelling had been fully investigated. There was also no provision for public open space, integrated transport measures or environmental improvements. The applicant had had a bat survey conducted & provided the additional information required. Cllr Jordan considered that there was no reason to change the Parish Council's 'No objections' comment.

Decision: No objections.

19/13.15

54752 **Insertion of velux windows to front & rear elevations, &** **Mr Allington**
Cllr Ms J Poole **insertion of window in north gable - 54 Lark Rise, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole explained that this was a retrospective application, submitted as a precaution, following a neighbour being refused permission for similar dormer windows. She considered this to be an attractive addition to the house. There were no privacy issues as the windows only overlooked farmland & the neighbours did not object.

Decision: No objections.

19/13.16

54768 **Single-storey extension to rear, after removal of existing** **Mr Tribe**
Cllr Ms J Kirby **extension - 122 Haslemere Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Kirby explained that the house was in the centre of a terrace of three houses. There was already a small extension, which contained a cloakroom & utility room, & this application was to create a slight enlargement of that. The neighbour already had an extension which this would match, there would be no overlooking & there were no objections from the neighbours. Cllr Ms Kirby considered that this would be an improvement.

Decision: No objections.

19/13.17

54775 **Detached garage - 5 Newtown Rd, Liphook** **Mr Oberthaler**
Cllr Ms J Kirby

Cllr Ms Kirby advised that the applicant owned the next but one house, 7 Newtown Rd, as well as his own house. There was a shared drive but no parking space for No 5, so the applicant wanted to build a large double garage. It would not be visible from anyone's house as it would be adjacent to shops & back gardens. Her only slight concern was whether there would still be sufficient room to manoeuvre vehicles without encroaching on the parking space for No 5a.

Decision: No objections.

19/13 ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS

There were none.

20/13 RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)

These were noted.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10.15pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 11 March 2013.

Signed
Presiding Chairman