



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 23 SEPTEMBER 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 B Moulard (EHDC) & Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) also attended, together with Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden), one member of the press & seven members of the public for parts of the meeting.

93/13 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 advised that the Parish Council response to the Joint Core Strategy consultation had been submitted on time.

He also referred to a public meeting held the previous week, when the Northcott Trust had revealed their proposals for new houses adjacent to Griggs Green/Bohunt School, & a relief road to join Station Rd & Longmoor Rd.

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.

94/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr P Jordan.

95/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Ms J Kirby - application for Bramshott Meadows, Burgh Hill Rd (Minute 99/13.2) as she knew the applicant;

Cllr T Maroney - application for tree work at 21 Stonehouse Rd (Minute 99/13.22) as he lived opposite.

96/13 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 19 AUGUST 2013
These were confirmed & signed as being a true record of the meeting.

97/13 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
None.

98/13 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION
Public Questions (items not on the agenda).
Mr Taylor (Goldenfields House, 53d Chiltley Lane) was concerned that many trees /hedgerows in Chiltley Lane had been removed, & asked whether the Parish Council was interested in taking up the cause. He had written to EHDC with his concerns, but as the trees/hedgerows were not TPO'd they had not taken any action.
Cllr Robinson advised that he had been speaking to a parishioner about this, & she had been told that EHDC were short of staff & did not have the time/resources to investigate.
Dr Evans considered that the trees had a high amenity value & should be TPO'd as this was an important asset for Liphook. He volunteered to speak to EHDC's Arboricultural Officer & suggested that the Parish Council should lobby EHDC.
The Chairman suggested that this should be a specific item on a future Planning Committee or full Council meeting agenda. Cllr Croucher advised that the item could be added to the agenda for the following week's full Council meeting, but he considered it more appropriate for the Parish Council to write to EHDC to request an investigation. The Chairman suggested that this could be covered in a Neighbourhood Plan, & Ms Kirby suggested it could still be incorporated into the Parish Plan.
Cllr Moulard asked to be copied into the correspondence.
It was agreed that the Chairman & Cllr Croucher would discuss the issue, once they had read the correspondence, & agree how best to proceed.
Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 93/13).

99/13 PLANNING APPLICATIONS **APPLICANT**

99/13.1

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| 21589/083 Cllr M Croucher | Variation of Condition 20 of permission 21589/080 to allow substitution of plans - Old Thorns Golf & Country Club, Weavers Down, Liphook | Old Thorns Golf & Country Club |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|

Cllr Croucher advised that this was a very minor change to an existing permission, involving a slight change to the profile of the top of the roof. He could see no reason to object.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.2

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| 25251/013 Cllr R Evans | Variation to works approved under LBC permission 25251/0012 - internal layout altered, minor external alterations & internal alterations to bedroom in main house - Bramshott Meadows, Burgh Hill Rd, Bramshott | Mr & Mrs Heath |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------|

Cllr Evans reported that this was a listed country house in the best possible taste. The application was for some very small changes to an existing permission, & was only required as the house was a listed building.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.3

35870/001 **Two-storey side extension, including re-building of existing** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr P Robinson **single-storey utility room & garages, & demolishing** **Iowe**
 projecting parts of existing garages - Farriers, 14 South Rd,
 Liphook

Cllr Robinson advised that the property was a 60's dormer bungalow of no architectural importance. The proposed application would not greatly extend the footprint of the existing building, but would require the demolition of the double garage & utility room in order to increase the depth of the footings, so that they would be adequate to support a two-storey building. This was a large property, set in over an acre of land, so the extension would be in-keeping with its surroundings. The proposed upstairs windows & balcony would overlook the householder's own garden, so there would be no loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.4

36057/001 **Two-storey extension to side - Berry Down, Hewshott Lane,** **Mrs Keen**
Cllr Ms J Kirby **Liphook**

Cllr Ms Kirby reported that the property used to be called Malahide, but the owner had changed the name back to its original name of Berry Down. A previous application had been refused as it was too large, but this was a completely different layout involving only a slight increase in the floor area. It would not overlook any other properties, so there was no reason to object.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.5

38042/003 **Single-storey extension to rear, following demolition of** **Mr Peeling &**
Cllr R Evans **existing conservatory - Naham, Conford Rd, Conford** **Ms Lawrence**

Cllr Evans reported that this was effectively a joint application with the attached property, Primrose Cottage (Minute 99/13.13), where two neighbours were working together to extend the rear of the properties to create garden rooms instead of conservatories. He considered that it would be a great improvement.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.6

50595/002 **Detached triple garage to front, after demolition of existing** **Mr Hutton**
Cllr Ms J Poole **garage - Ashdown House, Pines Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole explained that Ashdown House was previously a bungalow, but had been converted to a two-storey house. It had a single garage that would have matched the bungalow. The applicant now wanted to replace this garage with a triple garage with a raised roof to match the current house, in a new location further from the house than the present garage. The neighbours at Tamarisk & Woodlands had concerns about whether it would remain a garage & Cllr Ms Poole had advised them to send their concerns to EHDC. She considered that if permission was granted, conditions should be imposed to ensure that the garage was used solely for parking/storage.

Cllr Croucher claimed that it would constitute over-development; this was agreed by all members.

Decision: Object on the grounds of over-development, but should permission be granted would request conditions imposed to ensure that the building is only used as a garage, & not for any other purpose.

99/13.7

54570/003 Retention of child's playhouse & post/wire plant support Mr Leverett
Cllr Ms J Kirby - 81 Lark Rise, Liphook

Cllr Ms Kirby advised that neighbouring houses were very close by & that, as the post/wire fence was well over the 2m limit, it had led to disputes with neighbours. The applicant had erected it to prevent overlooking by nearby flats. Cllr Ms Kirby claimed that the playhouse was more like a slide on a platform with a small house on the platform & was only temporary. She suggested recommending that it be removed within one or two years.

Cllr Croucher stated that if the fence & playhouse were over 2m they should be removed; this was agreed.

Decision: Object as play house & plant support should not exceed 2m.

99/13.8

54570/004 Retention of carport - 81 Lark Rise, Liphook Mr Leverett
Cllr Ms J Kirby

Cllr Ms Kirby explained that there was a garage between the two properties & the applicant had constructed a roof in front of it to form a carport. As it was only open on one side, the applicant was required to obtain planning permission for it. Neither of the neighbours had any objections.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.9

54599 Temporary construction access route - Bramshott Place Helical (Liphook)
Cllrs M Croucher Phase 4 site, King George's Drive, Liphook Ltd
/D Jerrard

Cllr Croucher recommended objecting as there would be no requirement for the access if planning permission for the cottages/care home was refused. A vote was taken & all members agreed.

Decision: Object as would be no need if, as the Parish Council believes should be the case, permission is not granted for the application for 40 cottages & 64-bed care home (54599/001).

99/13.10

54599/001 40 cottages, 64-bed care home with associated bin stores, Helical (Liphook)
Cllrs M Croucher car parking, garages, ground modelling, landscaping & Ltd
/D Jerrard access, & extension to existing club house - Bramshott Place
Phase 4 site, King George's Drive, Liphook

Cllr Croucher stated that the Parish Council & residents had been consulted about this application, & certain amendments had been made as a result. The site had been an old hospital which was sold by the NHS; it lay dormant for many years but was earmarked for employment use. This never came about & then retirement/housing applications were made, which were eventually accepted as they provided some employment opportunities. The original retirement village was based on the footprint of the old hospital, but had twice been increased in size. This application was for more cottages & a care home, with access via the existing entrance. The fundamental point not covered in detail in the application was the fact that the site was farmland outside the development boundary, & also that further land would be available, so this could set a precedent. He recommended objecting strongly as the Parish Council did not support development in the countryside.

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

Firstly, Mr Burrell claimed that the most important point was that the site was on farmland. Mrs Ogden (representing 90 residents) read out a statement listing residents' concerns (Appendix 1). Mr Burrell added that the original application had claimed that 30 full-time jobs would be created, but in practice only five were actually generated. Mrs Ogden added that if the expansion were to go ahead, the general public would effectively have access to a gated community as the predicted traffic would mean that the gates would be almost permanently open, resulting in a lack of security. Cllr Croucher asked whether any of the existing cottages were available. Mr Burrell replied that, out of a total of 151 properties, 31 had been neither sold nor reserved, & three others were currently empty. Mrs Ogden added that most of the advertising was placed in the national press, such as Saga Magazine, rather than locally. Cllr Maroney asked whether the site was on the original SHLAA list; Mrs Ogden replied that it had been added in June this year. Mrs Ogden also claimed that the elderly residents were a drain on local resources, as there was generally one ambulance called each week. Mr Burrell stated that the average age of residents was probably between 73 & 78. Cllr Moulard stated that he had agreed to speak against the application at the forthcoming EHDC Planning Committee meeting & had requested a site visit. The meeting was then reconvened. Cllr Robinson was particularly concerned about the lack of drainage; he had attended a meeting with residents & had been shown photographs of flooding. Cllr Croucher recommended strongly objecting for all the reasons discussed, but adding a caveat that should permission be granted the cottages should not be built before the care home was up & running, & that 40% of the cottages should be affordable. A vote was taken; all were in favour.

Decision:

Strongly object to this application on the following grounds:

1. site is currently agricultural farmland;
 2. site is outside the settlement boundary, so would constitute development in the open countryside;
 3. site is not listed as a future development zone;
 4. site has very poor drainage & suffers constant flooding - any further development would exasperate this;
 5. no proven need as over 30 of the current properties are unoccupied & there are plenty of beds available at other local care homes;
 6. resultant increase in vehicular traffic would be detrimental to the rural Hewshott Lane;
 7. application does not meet local housing needs as not mixed/affordable &, based on profile of current residents, future residents unlikely to be local;
 8. more elderly people would be a further drain on local health resources;
 9. would harm the character of the area & lead to the loss of open land between Liphook & Hewshott Lane;
 10. the care home would be a large building, out-of-keeping with the area;
 11. would set a precedent for further development of Penally Farm.
- However, should permission be granted, would request that no cottages are built until the care home is built & occupied, & that 40% of the cottages should be affordable housing.

99/13.11

55130 **Two-storey extension to rear, following demolition of** **Mrs Bray**
Cllr Ms J Poole **conservatory - 10 Tower Close, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole stated that the neighbours at 8 Tower Close, who were most likely to be affected, had no objections. She had not been able to speak to the neighbours on the other side, but considered that the extension was unlikely to affect them. She could therefore see no reason to object.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.12

55132 **Extension to warehouse - Runfold Plastics Ltd, Passfield** **Runfold Plastics**
Cllr P Robinson **Mill Business Park, Mill Lane, Passfield** **Ltd**

Cllr Robinson reported that the existing building was constructed of steel profile panels on a steel framework & that the proposed extension, which would be used for storage purposes, would be built on an area of concrete hardstanding. Although the building, along with others on the estate, was believed to be in a river corridor with a risk of flooding, the applicant claimed that there had never been an occasion when the site had been inundated, even during the recent unprecedented & prolonged periods of rainfall.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.13

55152 **Single-storey extension to rear, following demolition of** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr R Evans **existing conservatory - Primrose Cottage, Conford Rd,** **Vincent**
 Conford

Cllr Evans referred to the earlier application for the attached cottage, Naham (Minute 99/13.5).

Decision: No objections.

TREE APPLICATIONS

99/13.14

22570/017 **Fell 3 alders & prune willow overhanging 14 Locke Rd - land** **Mr Renolds**
Dr M Evans **at Radford Park, London Rd, Liphook**

Dr Evans explained that the application had been submitted to reduce shading, but as the trees belonged to the Parish Council the decision should ultimately be made by the Radford Park Working Party. He therefore recommended objecting to the proposed felling of the alders, but allowing the overhanging branch of the willow to be pruned.

Decision: Object to felling the alders, but no objection to pruning the willow
 branch overhanging 14 Locke Rd.

99/13.15

24112/006 **Fell Liquid Amber - 10 Shepherds Way, Liphook** **Mr Maybrey**
Dr M Evans

Dr Evans reported that this was a beautiful tree from the Florida area, but this specimen was damaged & had no shape. The application was to fell it & replace it with another Liquid Amber, which he supported.

Decision: No objections, provided replaced with another Liquid Amber.

99/13.16

30094/004 Prune Turkish hazel overhanging 9 Goldenfields Mr Pretorius
Dr M Evans - 49 Shepherds Way, Liphook

Dr Evans advised that this was a mature specimen tree, with a branch overhanging the applicant's garden. The tree owner was not in favour of the work, but Dr Evans had no objections to the specified branch being removed as it was quite a small branch & its removal would benefit an acer it was currently shading.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.17

30758/005 Fell horse chestnut - 9 Willow Gardens, Liphook Mr Beynon
Dr M Evans

Dr Evans reported that this was one of a line of horse chestnut trees outside the property & one had already been felled two years ago. The applicant now wanted to fell another as it had fungal disease & bark missing, but was intending to replace it. Dr Evans had no objections provided a replacement was planted, which would be important as the trees had an amenity value.

Decision: No objections provided replacement tree planted.

99/13.18

31090/003 Prune Wellingtonia & Copper beech - 71 Shepherds Way, Mr Worrall
Dr M Evans Liphook

Dr Evans advised that the Wellingtonia was an impressive amenity tree, which could be seen from the whole Berg Estate. He had no objections to the proposed removal of a damaged branch. However, he was concerned about some of the proposed work to the Copper beech. It was around 50 years old & the application was to crown-reduce it by 20% & crown-lift it to 5m off the ground in order to reduce shading. Dr Evans did not object to the removal of the specified lower branches, but did not consider that the proposed crown-lifting would be beneficial to either the tree or to its amenity value.

Decision: No objections to removing damaged Wellingtonia branch, nor to crown-lifting the Copper beech, but object to the proposed crown-reduction of the Copper beech as do not consider that it would benefit either the tree or its amenity value.

99/13.19

34344/008 Prune yew overhanging 9 Goldenfields - 47 Shepherds Way, Mr Pretorius
Dr M Evans Liphook

Dr Evans reported that this was an ancient yew, probably over 200 years old. The application was to reduce the height by 80% to effectively extend the garden. The tree was in a neighbour's garden, but the neighbour had no objections to the proposed work. The tree had already been crown-reduced around three years ago & had not recovered.

Decision: Object as proposed work likely to kill the tree.

99/13.20

37519/001 **Fell 3 holly trees - 8 Ash Grove, Liphook** **Mrs Ray**
Dr M Evans

Dr Evans explained that the trees started life as holly bushes, were very close to the house & had no amenity value whatsoever.

Decision: No objections.

99/13.21

50591/001 **Prune Copper beech & Turkey oak - 6 Goldenfields Close,** **Mrs Clark**
Dr M Evans **Liphook**

Dr Evans could see no benefit to pruning the Copper beech, but considered that the proposed work to the Turkey oak would be beneficial.

Decision: No objections to proposed work to Turkey Oak, but object to work on Copper beech as can see no benefit.

99/13.22

55134 **Prune oak - 21 Stonehouse Rd, Liphook** **Mrs Powell**
Dr M Evans

Dr Evans advised that this was a large mature oak, & the application was to lift the lower branches & clean the tree, to which he did not object. However, the application was also to crown-reduce the tree by 20% in order to reduce shading, but Dr Evans did not consider this to be beneficial, especially as once done the work would need to be repeated in the future.

Decision: Object to proposed crown-reduction, but no objection to the other proposed work.

100/13 **ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS**

100/13.1

39047/002 **Open-fronted verandah to side - The Field House, Passfield** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr Robinson **Rd, Passfield** **Andrews**

Cllr Robinson reported that the property was a recent construction of no architectural interest & that the proposal was for an open-sided glazed porch to the west side of the property, where there was currently a concrete patio. The outside would comprise a low brick wall & the roof would be supported with reclaimed architectural pillars, but would be otherwise open-sided. It would not compromise the privacy of the neighbouring properties as it would look directly into the applicant's garden.

Decision: No objections.

TREE APPLICATION

100/13.2

49617/004 Prune 5 limes & fell 2 maples - 11 Tunbridge Crescent, Mrs Adcock
Dr M Evans Liphook

Dr Evans claimed that the garden was an interesting one as it was L-shaped & extended behind the rear of the garden of 9 Tunbridge Crescent, where this stand of trees was located. He had no objections as the maples were diseased/fire-damaged & the proposed work on the limes was not severe & should be beneficial. He added that the neighbour at 9 Tunbridge Crescent also had no objections.

Decision: No objections.

101/13 RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 2)
These were noted.

102/13 STREET NAMING
Former OSU site, Midhurst Rd, Liphook (33993/072)

The developer had proposed five possible street names, Edmonton, Calgary, Sudbury, Dawson & Vancouver, for the new development of 62 houses, which was currently under construction. The Preservation Society had been consulted & stated that their preference was for Edmonton, Calgary & Vancouver as they were well known Canadian cities, unlike Sudbury & Dawson. They also suggested Alberta, Hudson & St Lawrence as alternatives. Cllr Evans pointed out that there was already a Hudson Close, so it was agreed to request the names Edmonton, Calgary, Vancouver, Alberta & St Lawrence.

103/13 REPLACEMENT OF TPO TREES - EH 640 (G4)
Bohunt Manor, Portsmouth Rd, Liphook (SDNP/39366/018/TPOS)

It was noted that six replacement 1.8m English oaks would be planted in November 2013, & that an EHDC site visit would be conducted at the end of November to ensure that the new planting had taken place.

The meeting was adjourned for Dr Evans (Parish Tree Warden) to state that the trees should be mature ten-year old trees, & it was important that they were properly spaced. Mr Taylor (Goldenfields House, 53d Chiltley Lane) added that a ten-year management plan should be put in place to ensure that the trees were looked after. The meeting was then reconvened.

The Chairman suggested that these requests should be put to EHDC. A vote was taken; all in favour. It was agreed that the Chairman & Cllr Evans would be responsible for approaching EHDC.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 9.50pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 21 October 2013.

Signed
Presiding Chairman