



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 7.30PM IN THE HASKELL CENTRE, MIDHURST ROAD, LIPHOOK ON MONDAY 17 JUNE 2013.

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr D Jerrard (Chairman), Cllr M Croucher, Cllr R Evans, Cllr Ms J Kirby, Cllr T Maroney, Cllr Ms J Poole & Cllr P Robinson. Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr E Trotter & Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) also attended, together with Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden), four representatives of Helical Bar plc, one member of the press & four members of the public for parts of the meeting.

55/13 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/SDNPA.

56/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr P Jordan.

57/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

58/13 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 13 MAY 2013

These were confirmed & signed as being a true record of the meeting, subject to an amendment to Minute 48/13 to read "There were a number of potential sites in the Parish, *in addition to* the former OSU site, ..." rather than "... *such as* the former OSU site, ...".

59/13

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chairman advised that the Parish Council had been present at the recent exhibition about possible development at Bohunt Manor (Minute 48/13), and had collected comments made by members of the public. The local schools had advised that a planning application for a primary school on the site was expected to be submitted by the end of July. The Parish Council planned to hold a Public Forum, run by the Recreation/Planning Committees, and he had placed a resolution on the agenda for the Parish Council meeting the following week. The Council would need to agree details such as who should chair the meeting, who should speak & who should be invited. It was agreed that the Planning Committee should invite G L Hearn, the agents for Bohunt Manor site, to an informal meeting & to present their proposals at the Public Forum.

60/13

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

Public Questions (items not on the agenda).

Cllr Mrs Easton considered that the Parish Council should send the comments collected from members of the public at the Bohunt Manor exhibition, or at least a summary of them, to the SDNPA as part of the pre-application consultation. Cllr Maroney pointed out that this could lead to duplication as many people would have already submitted their comments themselves. The Chairman did not consider this to be a problem as people were permitted to submit multiply comments. Cllr Evans volunteered to summarise the public comments for submission to SDNPA.

Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 55/13).

61/13

VICE-CHAIRMAN

The Chairman proposed Cllr Ms Kirby as the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee. This was seconded by Cllr Croucher. A vote was taken (all in favour).

62/13

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT BRAMSHOTT PLACE, LIPHOOK

Mrs Morris (Barton Willmore) & Mr Hynds (PRP Architects) made a short presentation on behalf of Helical Bar plc, the owners of the Bramshott Place site. They advised that the existing village was nearing completion, & the proposal was for a further 40 cottages & a 64-bed care home to the east of the existing site. It would be a large plot, but the proposed development would be concentrated in the centre of it. The cottages would be of similar size & high quality design to those on the existing site, with low density build in small cul-de-sacs with parking courts. The care home would be two-storey, built around two courtyards & comprise four clusters of 16 ensuite bedrooms, each cluster with its own communal space/facilities. Access would be via the main entrance of the existing site, with a separate access road branching off the main road. Questions were invited:

Q. Would the cottages be warden-controlled?

A. For over 55's, designed to accommodate various levels of disability, with warden to provide help/assistance as in existing site, additional domiciliary/nursing help from a central source would be available as & when needed.

Q. Current residents have claimed that they can only have a certain level of nursing help before they are expected to leave?

A. Not correct - all residents can access as much care as they want - this would provide centralised care, but residents would still be able to choose their care provider; the choice would not be limited to the centralised care provided.

- Q. When the planning application was submitted & withdrawn last year, residents were concerned that the additional accommodation would result in a fall in the value of the original properties.
- A. No planning application has been submitted, but have been working towards this for some time - have conducted two workshops with current residents & amended plans in view of the response to the consultations. This would provide better balance as would complement the existing use.
- Q. Would it provide employment for the village?
- A. Yes - around 30 jobs.
- Q. Is the site inside the Settlement Boundary/suitable development for Green Belt?
- A. The site is outside the Settlement Boundary, but is not Green Belt - the original retirement village was built on a brownfield site. Barton Willmore would have to put the case to the Planning Authority.
- Q. What facilities would be offered?
- A. Care home would be a self-contained community. The cottages could use the facilities for the existing cottages, such as the clubhouse, shop, library & swimming pool, which could be expanded.
- Q. Who owns Penally Farm/any plans to extend beyond new proposed site?
- A. Penally Farm & Bramshott Place both owned by Helical Bar plc. No current plans to extend further as restricted by SPA land to the east.
- Q. Will application include list of jobs to be created?
- A. Yes, plus other economic benefits for the community including construction & spend from existing/new residents.
- Q. What is anticipated timetable?
- A. Currently consulting with HCC/EHDC - expect to submit application before the end of July.
- Q. Any possibility of sports pitches?
- A. Unlikely due to proximity to SPA land as would not be compatible use, also too distant from centre of Liphook.
- Q. Would development extend into Conservation Area?
- A. No.
- Q. Will ecology surveys be conducted?
- A. Already conducted & no protected species/trees/hedges found. Bat survey currently being conducted.
- Q. Plan for display in Parish Office?
- A. No as still evolving/further consultation - will provide once finalised.

63/13

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

APPLICANT

63/13.1

20449/014

Cllr R Evans

**Two-storey side extension, two-storey rear extension
& single-storey side extension - Conford Park House,
Conford Rd, Conford**

**Mr & Mrs
Acott**

Cllr Evans reported that it was a very large house in extremely large grounds & the proposals would not affect anyone else. He could see no planning reasons to object.

Decision:

No objections.

63/13.2

26082/004 **Detached dwelling within curtilage, following demolition** **Mr Cook**
Cllr P Robinson **of rear extensions & addition to front of dwelling**
 - 32 London Rd, Liphook

Cllr Robinson reported that the property was the first after the unadopted drive adjacent to the Recreation Ground entrance. It fronted onto the London Rd, but the access for the property, & for the proposed property, was from the drive. The proposal would not result in any loss of privacy for the neighbouring properties, 30a & 34 London Rd, nor would any trees be affected. The adjacent site, originally that of 30 London Rd, had already been split into two plots. The two-storey extension to the front of the existing property would increase the size of the existing rooms & add a fifth bedroom. The property was central to a large plot, so would not look out of place. The first-floor windows would overlook the London Rd & to the south, the Recreation Ground. He recommended not objecting to the proposal.

Decision: No objections.

63/13.3

29380/004 **Single-storey rear extension - 1 Avenue Close, Liphook** **Mr Chiles**
Cllr Ms Poole

Cllr Ms Poole had visited the site, but had been unable to view the rear as nobody was there. She stated that the extension was a small addition to the kitchen, & was unlikely to affect anyone else as all the properties were surrounded by high hedges.

The meeting was adjourned to allow Mrs Askall (7 Avenue Close) to speak about the application. She claimed that there had already been two major extensions, one of which had involved a raised roof & additional floor. She claimed that although this would only be a small extension, it would involve major structural work requiring new RSJs & extensive drainage work. The bungalow was on a very small plot & this would constitute over-development & would also result in boiler vents pointing towards her house. The meeting was reconvened.

Cllr Maroney considered that, for a modern development, the garden would still be adequate & therefore disagreed that this would be over-development of the plot.

Cllr Robinson also did not consider this to be over-development, but considered that the boiler vent should be re-located so as not to be detrimental to the amenities of 7 Avenue Close, as both houses were in close proximity to the boundary.

Cllr Ms Poole stated that she had originally not seen any reason to object, but suggested that the Parish Council should make some reference to the amenities of 7 Avenue Close. This was agreed.

Decision: Concerns about possible detrimental effect on amenities of neighbour at 7 Avenue Close (proximity of boiler vent to house; loss of light). Consider a site visit to be essential.

63/13.4

32643/003 **Two-storey front extension, single-storey rear extension &** **Mr White**
Cllr P Robinson **side porch - Little Orchard, 18 Church Rd, Bramshott**

Cllr Robinson explained that the two-storey front extension was really a porch to the front, supporting an extension to a bedroom. It would protrude about 1m in front of the existing building line & would not restrict parking or vehicle movement on the drive. The side extension was merely a porch, open to both sides. The rear extension would extend around 4m, over an existing patio; there was a substantial garden to accommodate it & it would not result in any loss of privacy for neighbours.

Decision: No objections.

63/13.5

35179/006 **Retention of garage, porch & dormer, plus front extension to garage, conversion of part of garage to en-suite & alterations to existing access - Cherry Tree Cottage, Hammer Vale** **Mr Prisgrove**
Cllr M Croucher

Cllr Croucher reported that the property had already been modified on several occasions, & to some extent this was just regularising what had built. A near neighbour had submitted comments to the Planning Officer, but they were not really a planning issue. There was adequate space for parking on-site, so no reason to object.

Decision: No objections.

63/13.6

50398/003 **Replacement dwelling, following demolition of existing dwelling & outbuildings - Old Barn Farm Bungalow, Hewshott Lane, Liphook** **Mr Gilbert**
Cllr M Croucher

Cllr Croucher advised that this was a single-storey workman's cottage with a history of several planning applications, the principle one being to increase the roof height by 2m in order to utilise the roof space. Permission for this had been granted, but had now expired. The applicant was now asking for permission to demolish the existing building & replace it. From speaking to the Case Officer, it appears that this original permission may have been granted in error as a room included in the calculations of the original footprint size should not have been included, & the application should therefore have been refused under the 50% rule as the site was in the countryside. This new application would also break the rule & Cllr Croucher considered that the Parish Council should object as it would result in the loss of a small property in the countryside.

Decision: Object as would lead to the loss of a small property in the countryside, & be contrary to Policy H16. Also it is possible that the previous permissions for increasing the roof height to provide further accommodation were technically invalid.

63/13.7

51865/003 **Temporary (12-month) siting of cabin with associated parking for five vehicles (to assist in construction of wardens' base - approved application 51865/003) - National Trust Wardens' Base, Tunbridge Lane, Bramshott** **The National Trust**
Cllr R Evans

Cllr Evans explained that the National Trust were just requesting permission for a cabin to enable them to conduct their work, so there was no reason to object.

Decision: No objections.

63/13.8

54780 **Reinstatement of property, following fire damage, including new roof, windows & removal of chimney - The Green Dragon, 2 London Rd, Liphook** **Enterprise Inns plc**
54780/001
Cllr Ms J Kirby

Cllr Ms Kirby reported that The Green Dragon was a Listed Building in the Conservation Area, which had suffered a great deal of damage in a recent fire. The applicant had employed a specialist firm to restore everything that had been destroyed, apart from the original tin roof, with authentic materials.

Decision: No objections provided restored to Conservation Area/Listed Building standards.

63/13.9

54891 Detached triple garage - Lower Flat, 1A Chase Villas, Seven Mr Wickham
Cllr T Maroney Thorns Lane, Bramshott Chase

Cllr Mahoney reported that this was a four-storey building, split into two flats. The owner did not currently live there, but used the attached double garage to store a classic car. There was currently permission to demolish the existing double garage & replace it with a two-storey extension to the house & a new detached double garage. This application was to build a triple garage, instead of the approved double. The ground dipped sharply at the front of the garage so that the extension would not be seen from the road. As there was already permission for the extension & a double garage, & sufficient space for a triple, Cllr Maroney saw no reason to object to this application.

Decision: No objections.

63/13.10

54909 Two-storey rear extension & two side porch canopies Mr Ireland
Cllr Ms J Kirby - 24 Newtown Rd, Liphook

Cllr Ms Kirby explained that the property had two bedrooms upstairs & a downstairs bathroom. The proposal was to extend the downstairs bathroom & convert it into a family area, & to extend the upstairs to create an additional bedroom, whilst converting one of the original upstairs bedrooms into a bathroom. This would not affect the garden, so there would be no loss of amenities, & the new windows would all overlook the garden.

Decision: No objections.

63/13.11

54926 Outline application - two detached dwellings - land to south Mr & Mrs
Cllr T Maroney /west of Elsfeld House, Portsmouth Rd, Bramshott Chase Turner

Cllr Maroney reported that the site was a large piece of land, surrounded on two sides by tall trees & 6ft timber fencing, which was big enough to accommodate two four-bedroom houses. The documentation included historical deeds showing four plots, demonstrating that the land was intended for housing. The trees would be preserved, so there was no reason to object.

Decision: No objections provided trees retained/protected. Would request EHDC to consider issuing a TPO to protect the trees.

63/13.12

54946 Single-storey front extension - 24 Chalcraft Close, Liphook Mr & Mrs
Cllr Ms Poole Moran

Cllr Ms Poole explained that the applicant wanted to extend the end of their property to square it off. She had spoken to the neighbour, who had no objections, & saw no reason for the Parish Council to object.

Decision: No objections.

TREE APPLICATIONS

63/13.13

34399/002 **Prune Norway maple Crimson King - Burleigh House,** **Mrs Westmoreland**
Dr M Evans **Bramshott Court, Tunbridge Lane, Bramshott**

Dr Evans reported that the application was to crown-lift & prune a couple of the lower branches in order to give a small adjacent mulberry tree more light to allow it to flourish. He had no objections to the proposed work.

Decision: No objections.

63/13.14

50680/003 **Prune oak - Public Open Space, Admers Crescent, Liphook** **Radian Housing**
Dr M Evans

Dr Evans advised that the proposed work was to prevent damage to the roof of 74 Admers Crescent. The branch was very close to the roof, but not actually touching it. However, the tree was unbalanced & pruning it would improve the shape of the tree, as well as giving more light to 74 Admers Crescent. It was a lovely tree in extremely good health & the work would be beneficial.

Decision: No objections.

64/13 ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS

64/13.1

24279/008 **Alterations to shop front & front elevation - Jarvis House,** **Mr Collinson**
Cllr Ms J Kirby **20-22A The Square, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Kirby reported that EHDC's Conservation Officer had agreed with the Parish Council that the application should include a change of use from offices to residential. The Parish Council had seen the original application in March & had not objected to the proposed alterations. The original application was withdrawn to enable alterations to be made to reflect the comments of the Conservation Officer.

Decision: No objections.

64/13.2

24784/005 **Single-storey side extension - 17 Headley Rd, Liphook** **Mr Campbell**
Cllr P Robinson

Cllr Robinson advised that the extension was actually to the rear; not to the side. The proposal was to demolish an existing sunroom/conservatory & replace it with a single-storey brick & tile extension, which would extend to the outside south facing wall of the building. He could see no reason to object as no trees would be affected & the neighbours would not be affected as the boundaries were a solid fence & a high hedge.

Decision: No objections.

65/13 RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)

These were noted.

66/13

PLANNING APPEAL

Land to west of Admers Lane, Liphook (SDNP/12/01276)

It was noted that an appeal by Liphook Golf Club (re: refusal of planning permission for continued use of land for golf-related purposes) would be conducted by means of an Informal Hearing to be held at 10am on 9 July 2013 at LMC. Original Parish Council comments (“*No objections.*”) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

AFTERNOTE: The Hearing has been cancelled as it has been changed to a Public Inquiry (date/location TBA).

67/13

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT

24 Chalcraft Close, Liphook (54946/001)

It was noted that an application had been made to ascertain whether planning permission was required for a single-storey rear extension & alterations to provide a side window.

68/13

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY (NPWP)

Cllr Ms Kirby (NPWP Chairman) reported that the consensus was that the WP were waiting to see the results of the SHMA survey, the outcome of the possible development of the Bohunt Manor frontage & the presentation of the Parish Plan before making any further decisions. She understood that it was likely that another 150-200 houses would be allocated to Liphook. She added that one of the major obstacles was getting more people involved/to help.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 9.20pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 15 July 2013.

Signed
Presiding Chairman