



# 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 FEBRUARY 2014.**

## MINUTES

### PRESENT WERE:

Cllr D Jerrard (Chairman), Cllr M Croucher, Cllr R Evans, Cllr P Jordan, Cllr Ms J Kirby, Cllr T Maroney, Cllr Ms J Poole & Cllr P Robinson. Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) also attended, together with Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden), two representatives of Bloor Homes & nine members of the public for parts of the meeting.

### 13/14 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/other 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.

### 14/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr B Mouland (EHDC).

### 15/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

### 16/14 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 30 JANUARY 2014

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

### 17/14 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

### 18/14 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

Public Questions (items not on the agenda). None.

Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 13/14).

19/14

**PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT CHILTLEY FARM, CHILTLEY LANE, LIPHOOK - RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Roderick Bluh (Tristan Fitzgerald Associates) gave a short presentation on behalf of Bloor Homes. He introduced his colleague Rebecca Fenn-Tripp (Turley Associates) & apologised that Elaine Vashi (Bloor Homes) had been unable to attend. He explained that Bloor Homes were proposing a development of around 112 dwellings on Chiltley Farm, which was adjacent to the Settlement Boundary. The site had been identified & assessed as part of the East Hampshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). It had been concluded that the site had the potential to deliver 164 homes, although Bloor Homes considered that a lower density would be more appropriate in this location. The current access to the site was via Chiltley Lane, but Bloor were proposing a single access from Willow Gardens, which would protect the character of Chiltley Lane as well as linking the development to the Berg Estate. An exhibition was held on 18 January & around 200 people attended. Questionnaires were handed out & 88 were returned, with most responses being from Berg Estate residents. A further 55 letters were received. Mr Bluh circulated a hand-out showing the six questions & a summary of the findings. Around nine in ten respondents agreed that a density lower than the SHLAA target of 164 was desirable; & eight in ten were aware of the local need for affordable housing. Most of the additional comments given centred around perceived traffic/access problems, as well as the contention that Liphook was expected to accommodate too much development & claims that the site was prone to flooding. He added that Bloor Homes would be submitting a planning application shortly & would do all they could to alleviate resident's concerns. He then invited questions:

Q. Are there any plans to change the layout?

A. The boards only show indicative layout, but final layout will be similar.

Q. When will application be submitted?

A. In the spring.

Q. What about the mix/layout of affordable housing?

A. The detail is being worked on with the Planning Authority, & a mix of two/three-bedroom properties are being considered.

Q. Was consideration given to accessing the site from top end of Chiltley Lane /Highfield Lane, rather than from Berg Estate?

A. Unable to answer at present as this had been investigated by Highway Consultant.

Q. Any assessment done as to whether residents likely to walk/drive to village?

A. Will be part of the assessment process - results of study will be included in planning application.

20/14

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**APPLICANT**

20/14.1

28131/005

**Raise roof to provide first-floor extension - Tween Oaks,  
Liphook Rd, Passfield**

**Mr & Mrs  
Melrose**

Cllr Evans reported that the site was past Passfield Common, towards Headley. This property was the last in a row of what were 1960's bungalows, many of which, including the adjacent one, had been converted into houses. This would transform it & more than double the amount of accommodation. There would be no windows in the side, so there were no overlooking concerns. He recommended not objecting as he considered that it would be an improvement. A vote was taken (all in favour).

**Decision:**

No objections.

## 20/14.2

**53807**                      **Single-storey extension to side - 33 Hazelbank Close, Liphook**      **Ms Probert**  
**Cllr Ms J Poole**

Cllr Ms Poole explained that this would be a very narrow extension onto this end-of-terrace house, which would be adjacent to a side road leading to garages. It would incorporate a utility room to the kitchen & a shower room. It would run the length of the house, replacing a rather unsightly lean-to shed which currently covered most of the length & had been there for a considerable amount of time. This would make it a proper extension & be an improvement.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

## 20/14.3

**54806**                      **Raise roof height & add dormers to front/rear to provide**                      **Mr & Mrs**  
**Cllr P Robinson**      **first-floor accommodation, new pitched roof over garage &**                      **Warren**  
                                 **single-storey garden room to rear - 8 Chitley Lane, Liphook**

Cllr Robinson advised that the proposal was to raise the roof by 1m & add dormer windows to front & rear to provide first-floor accommodation. It would also provide a new pitched roof over the garage & a single-storey garden room to the rear. Raising the roof-line would be in-keeping with similar extensions on adjacent properties & the dormer windows would not affect the privacy of neighbours. Incorporation of the currently detached garage into the property would necessitate demolition of the existing garage, which was in poor condition, & would improve the entryway into the rear garden. The proposed entrance hall would not extend beyond the existing building-line & would be only slightly larger than the existing porch, & the garden room would be only a little larger than the existing conservatory. The plot was large enough to accommodate these changes & no trees would be affected.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

## 20/14.4

**55364**                      **Single-storey extension to side with a room in the roof,**                      **Mr Spice**  
**Cllr Ms J Kirby**      **following demolition of garage - 9 Meadow Close, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Kirby reported that this was a two-bedroom bungalow in need of modernisation, with only two bedrooms, one of which was tiny. The bungalow opposite had been extended in the same way & looked extremely attractive. The proposed work would result in three small bedrooms downstairs, one of which would most likely be used as a study, & a fourth bedroom in the loft area which had only velux windows, meaning that there would be no overlooking issues. The only adverse comment made by neighbours was the impact on parking, but there was ample space & the applicant had incorporated further parking spaces into the plans as a result of this comment.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

## 20/14.5

**55375**                      **Single-storey rear extension - 10 Copperwood Close, Liphook**      **Mr Beechcroft**  
**Cllr P Jordan**

Cllr Jordan explained that the house was at the end of the new small development opposite Bohunt School. It was in a triangular plot of land & the extension would fill one tip of the plot, whilst still leaving some garden area. He had not been able to speak to the neighbours, but had left 'yellow slips', & he could see no reason to object.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

## TREE APPLICATIONS

20/14.6

**39066/001 Prune oak - 10 Wey Lodge Close, Liphook**  
**Dr M Evans**

**Mr & Mrs  
Horlock**

Dr Evans claimed that this was an extremely comprehensive application. The tree, a mature oak around 22m tall, was very close to the house with branches overhanging it. Part of the application was to remove these branches & Dr Evans had no objections to this, or to the proposed cleaning of the tree. He did, however, object to the second part of the application, which was to crown reduce the tree by 3/4m as it was considered unsafe. The tree was one of a stand & Dr Evans considered that making it shorter would detract from the amenity value.

**Decision:** No objections to removal of branches overhanging house/roof or to cleaning deadwood. However, do object to proposed crown reduction as tree is one of a stand & reducing the height would be detrimental to the amenity value.

20/14.7

**55356 Prune willow & fell hawthorn - 15 Stonehouse Rd, Liphook**  
**Dr M Evans**

**Mr Mapstone**

Dr Evans explained that the application was to pollard a willow, which was at the bottom of the garden close to Radford Park, & remove an unwieldy hawthorn, replacing it with either a rowan, silver birch or another willow. Dr Evans had no objections as the willow would re-generate & the hawthorn was not an amenity tree.

**Decision:** No objections.

20/14.8

**55388 Prune European ash - 35 Huron Drive, Liphook**  
**Dr M Evans**

**Mr Weston**

Dr Evans reported that the application was to crown reduce an ash to the rear of the property &, as permission had already been granted to crown reduce another ash to the rear of the adjacent property, this was not an unreasonable request.

**Decision:** No objections.

**21/14 ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS**

There were none.

**22/14 RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)**

These were noted.

**23/14 BOHUNT MANOR WORKING PARTY**

Cllr Jordan had no further news about whether the application had been submitted, but advised that he understood that the roundabout for the medical centre on Portsmouth Rd would only be funded by the developer if permission for housing was granted. The Chairman added that Chris Beaver, the consultant for GVI, had left G L Hearn & set up his own business, but was continuing to act for GVI.

**RECENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**The Motion:** "This Council supports the proposal to request that our District Councillors and EHDC Strategic Planning experts, together with ourselves, investigate and highlight the respective pro's and con's of the competing development proposals recently announced."

Proposed by: Cllr P Jordan

Cllr Jordan explained that he felt the Liphook area was under unprecedented pressure from approved & proposed housing development. There were some 375 approved dwellings yet to be started, while some were currently under construction. Additionally there were proposals for a further 568 dwellings on four sites, excluding the recently refused 104 dwellings at Bramshott Place which could well go to appeal. The JCS has specified a minimum of 175 dwellings, which would be additional to the 375 approved dwellings yet to be started.

The Parish Council had the opportunity to formulate a Neighbourhood Plan, which if approved by an Inspector, would carry weight in the planning process. However the Parish Council, like many other parish/town councils in the District, did not have the time or resources to produce such a document. In the meantime, developers were putting forward various proposals. Cllr Jordan had placed the Motion as he wanted the various submissions to be evaluated from an unbiased perspective, based on professional advice, & taking issues such as drainage, infrastructure demands & traffic into consideration. A full evaluation would be a major undertaking which, if contracted out, could cost at least £20,000 in consultancy fees, so Cllr Jordan proposed that a group of four or five people, made up of Parish & District Councillors & EHDC planning officers, should evaluate the key issues of each submission. The group could co-opt in resources, such as County Council input, as required. Both Cllr Mouland (EHDC) & Cllr Cowper (Leader, EHDC) had offered their support.

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

Firstly, Mr Ellis (Liphook) stated that the problem was not down to individual applications, but the combined effect of them all, which would result in Liphook grinding to a halt. He concluded that it was a good idea for councils to communicate & have a co-ordinated approach, but considered that developers should also be made to get together. The Chairman advised that this was neither practical nor legally enforceable.

Mrs Heath (Bramshott) asked how many of the proposed developments were likely to go ahead. Cllr Jordan advised that the JCS stated a minimum of 175 dwellings, but that was the minimum figure, not the maximum.

Cllr Mrs Easton stated that the recent JCS update had intimated that permissions would be granted on a 'first come, first served' basis until the limit was reached, & after that any further sustainable developments would also be allowed.

Cllr Ms Kirby stated that the Parish Plan group had contacted EHDC about SHLAA sites, & had received mixed messages as to whether developments beyond the 175 dwellings might be viewed as unsustainable.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan stated that a public meeting could be divisive, as people were less likely to accept sites close to their homes, & the purpose of the group was to be unbiased & look at all proposals objectively.

Cllr Robinson claimed that the current traffic situation was intolerable & developers were not addressing the issue. Cllr Jordan replied that developers would not spend the amount of money required for traffic impact assessments before submitting an application.

Cllr Croucher considered that EHDC would be able to provide resources & support to the Parish Council & to other Parish Councils in the District.

Cllr Maroney asked whether this would mean that the Parish Council would not produce a Neighbourhood Plan. Cllr Jordan replied that a Neighbourhood Plan would take a long time to produce as it would need to be approved by a Government Inspector.

Cllr Jordan claimed that it would be necessary to look at SHLAA sites not yet evaluated, as well as sites muted by developers, in order to look at the issue as a whole. The Chairman agreed & pointed out that, as the Parish Council did not have the time or resources to do so, getting advice from EHDC would be beneficial.

Cllr Ms Kirby stated that the Parish Plan group had been evaluating SHLAA sites objectively; following SDNPA guide-lines (EHDC had not produced any guide-lines).

Cllr Jordan pointed out that the Parish Plan had different objectives as it was seeking consensus, whereas this exercise needed to be short, sharp & focused, & therefore the Parish Plan would not be the right vehicle to achieve this. Cllr Croucher claimed that the two groups could run in parallel, & feed into each other, which could be achieved by Cllr Ms Kirby belonging to both groups.

The Chairman proposed voting on the Motion on the understanding that the group would comprise Cllr Ms Kirby, Cllr Croucher, Cllr Moulard (EHDC) & an EHDC officer, bringing in other councillors as & when required. A vote was taken (all in favour).

## **CONCLUSIONS**

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 8.55pm.  
Confirmed at the meeting held on 17 March 2014.

Signed . . . . .  
Presiding Chairman