



BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK PARISH COUNCIL

www.bramshottandliphook-pc.gov.uk

Mr P J STANLEY
EXECUTIVE OFFICER
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 PEAK CENTRE, MIDHURST ROAD, LIPHOOK ON
MONDAY 14 JULY 2014.**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs J Kirby (Chairman), Cllr M Croucher, Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr R Evans, Cllr P Jordan, Cllr T Maroney, Cllr Ms J Poole & Cllr P Robinson. Cllr D Jerrard, Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer) & one member of the press also attended, together with Cllr B Mouland (EHDC), Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden) & around 50 members of the public for parts of the meeting.

74/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman asked those present to switch off mobile phones & pointed out the fire exits.

She then explained that, given the large number of public in attendance, 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, councillors could then question or comment on the details of 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.

75/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

76/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Jordan - new dwellings at High Pines, 44 Midhurst Rd, Liphook (Minute 80/14.9).

77/14 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 9 JUNE 2014

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

78/14 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

79/14 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION
Public Questions (items not on the agenda). None.
Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 74/14).

80/14 PLANNING APPLICATIONS APPLICANT

80/14.1

21026/043 Multi-purpose sports hall with kitchen/server, store, plant Bohunt School
Cllr P Jordan room & disabled toilet - Bohunt Community School, & Centre
Longmoor Rd, Liphook

Cllr Jordan reported that he had left a note at four houses in Victoria Way, but had only received one reply from a resident who did not object to the application. He explained that the block would be 9.4m tall to give sufficient room for sports to be played in the hall. The school needed this extension as pupil numbers had been increasing over the past five years.

Decision: No objections.

80/14.2

21589/085 Two-storey extension to existing sports bar - Old Thorns Old Thorns Golf
Cllr M Croucher Golf & Country Club, Weavers Down, Liphook & Country Club

Cllr Croucher explained that this was basically an infill as the extension would be surrounded by buildings, & would not therefore have any impact on the surrounding area.

Decision: No objections.

80/14.3

22789/006 Residential development comprising 100 dwellings & Bloor Homes
Cllrs Mrs J Kirby associated public open space, following change of use of (Southern)
/Mrs B Easton land & demolition of existing buildings - Poultry Farm,
Chiltley Lane, Liphook

Cllr Mrs Easton introduced the application. She advised members that the site was currently an operational chicken farm & the proposal was for 100 two-storey residential dwellings, including 40% affordable housing. The applicant had held a public consultation, which had resulted in the number of proposed houses being reduced from 164 & a change to the layout to provide public open space in the centre of the site. The site currently accommodated some 18,000 birds in three poultry houses & HGV's accessed the site via The Square/Chiltley Lane. The site was 4.46 hectares (about ten acres) & was an EHDC included SHLAA site. It was adjacent to the settlement boundary & the Chiltley Lane Area of Special Housing Character, but not to the SDNP, & it was within 2km of most local facilities including schools. The proposed access would be through Willow Gardens with pedestrian access from Chiltley Lane, which would be used for construction traffic. There would be a mix of housing sizes/styles, including three groups of flats, & a mix of off-road parking areas, private driveways & garages. The majority of existing trees/vegetation would be preserved & there would be no overlooking, loss of privacy or light to existing properties.

Cllr Mrs Kirby explained that she & Cllr Mrs Easton had considered the application in the light of various policies & with the knowledge that Liphook was deemed to be a sustainable settlement. The site had adequate access, which had been approved by HCC, & a low flood risk which would be mitigated by a 30m buffer zone. The application included sufficient affordable housing, was of a scale appropriate for Liphook compared to other sites, did not exceed the housing allocation & was low density, reflecting the adjacent Berg Estate.

Cllr Jordan was concerned about traffic movements onto the Midhurst Rd & through The Square, & considered the site too distant from facilities compared to other potential sites.

Cllr Maroney stated that the Parish Plan Group had looked at various sites & this appeared to have the least problems, therefore he viewed the application favourably.

Cllr Ms Poole agreed with Cllr Maroney.

Cllr Evans claimed that the Midhurst Rd was too narrow & not adequate for additional traffic.

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

Firstly, Mr Halliday stated that the siting was incoherent & illogical within Liphook, being 3km from the schools; the proposed development would increase car activity & exasperate traffic problems, & create safety issues for the Midhurst Rd & railway bridge. He was pleased that the proposed number of houses had been reduced, but considered that the proposed development would disagree with the character of the Berg Estate, which had special status & consisted of only 100 houses, as it would have a very different look/feel.

Mrs Trant claimed that Midhurst Rd was dangerous for pedestrians, especially when walking children to school, & added that double yellow lines planned for the roads around the schools would lead to less parking being available there.

Mrs Robson queried where the children in the new development would go to school as the existing schools were full. Cllr Maroney replied that HCC planned to limit catchment areas & there was funding for expansion of the existing schools.

Mrs Holland claimed that Chiltley Lane was not suitable for construction traffic.

Mrs Hogan was concerned about parking over-spilling onto the Berg Estate.

Mrs Heath asked whether this would affect future planning applications made by Berg Estate residents. Cllr Mrs Easton replied that the Berg Estate was designated as an Area of Special Housing Character, with separate planning policies.

Mrs Watson claimed that there was Japanese knotweed on the site, which would be detrimental to any housing.

Mr Ellis considered that the proposed development would result in additional school traffic, which would exasperate the current problems.

Mr Robinson claimed that the site would not be considered sustainable under the National Planning Framework guidelines as it was too far from the centre of Liphook.

Mr Feeney queried the routing of the construction traffic. Mr McKenzie, who owned the site, claimed that HGV's currently accessed the site. He added that the farm was not using land that could be used for a relief road, the development on the site was deliverable & he regularly received complaints from neighbours on the Berg Estate about the chicken farm.

Elaine Vashi (Bloor Homes) stated that the car parking provision met EHDC's standards & was shown in the Transport Assessment, & that it included 205 allocated spaces in garages/on driveways & 22 unallocated spaces in parking bays. Bloor was aware of the knotweed problem & it was under control. The intention was to use Chiltley Lane for construction traffic & EHDC would impose conditions to control that as part of any planning permission.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan claimed that the special character of the Berg was due to its architecture, layout & ambience, & that a through route to the proposed new estate would not enhance it. Cllr Mrs Kirby replied that the number of cars passing through would not affect the character, & pointed out that The Square, with listed buildings in a Conservation Area, also had to accommodate a great deal of traffic.

Cllr Mrs Easton considered that if permission were granted, it should be conditional upon the provision of land for allotments.

Cllr Mrs Kirby stated that the site was defined as sustainable as it was within 2km of most facilities &, as the proposed number of dwellings had been reduced, as low density, which was important as it would be adjacent to the Berg Estate. The development would have no direct effect on either the SDNP or the Wealden Heaths. However, the traffic would have an impact on the railway bridge, so in-line with National Planning Framework guidelines, the development should provide for improvements to the infrastructure.

Cllr Jordan argued that there was a need to consider the effect on both the residents of the Berg Estate & the new development.

Cllr Mrs Easton proposed that the Parish Council should raise no objections to the application, subject to conditions covering concerns about traffic movements in Midhurst Rd, open space provision, eradication of the Japanese knotweed & restriction of on-street parking. A vote was taken (five in favour; two objections).

Decision:

No objections subject to:

1. developer contributions provided to support improvements to Midhurst Rd, in particular to railway bridge & pedestrian safety;
2. public open space in the form of allotments;
3. removal of Japanese Knotweed from site;
4. consideration given to additional on-site parking spaces to alleviate need for on-street parking in Berg Estate.

80/14.4

24460/002

Single-storey rear extension, following demolition of conservatory - 86 Midhurst Rd, Liphook

Mr & Mrs Poeti

Cllr Ms Poole advised that the house was set back behind 90 Midhurst Rd. There was a make-shift conservatory which the applicant wanted to demolish, so that they could extend the property over part of an existing patio to create an extra bedroom & more living space. It would be a single-storey extension with a pitched roof with roof-light, which would match the rest of the property. It would not be overlooked or affect any other property, & would be a great improvement.

Decision:

No objections.

33993/074 **60-bed nursing home with access, car parking & landscaping - former OSU site, Midhurst Rd, Liphook**
Cllrs M Croucher
/P Jordan

Highwood & Taylor Wimpey Homes

Cllr Jordan reminded members that the applicant had presented their proposals to the Committee on 20 January this year. The site was owned by Taylor Wimpey & had permission for employment use, but had been unable to market it successfully. They were therefore proposing a 60-bed care home, which they claimed would generate 60 - 90 local jobs, less traffic than a commercial enterprise & would enable them to increase the number of affordable houses on the site from six to ten. This planning application was in-line with the earlier proposals. Access would be via the estate & the existing access into Midhurst Rd would be closed. The application claimed that the care home would create 70% less traffic than commercial employment & argued that there was no requirement for additional on-site parking for the station.

Cllr Jordan considered that the key issues were whether commercial or care home employment was wanted, would it be local, had the applicant tried hard enough to market the site & was the lack of provision of additional station car parking still an issue.

Cllr Evans claimed that nursing homes tended to provide a very different type of employment, usually low paid & not necessarily local.

Cllr Jordan stated that there were 27 parking spaces; 15 for visitors, three for disabled people & seven or eight for staff, which he did not consider adequate for 80 staff. Cllr Mrs Kirby pointed out that the site was close to both bus routes & the railway station so staff could travel to work by public transport. She added that the District had an ageing population which needed to be catered for, & that the OSU site could not be completed unless some form of commercial build went ahead.

Cllr Jordan recommended objecting to the application as he considered that the developer should create a commercial site.

Cllr Robinson queried whether this was the right place to house the elderly & infirm, & that a rural setting would be more appropriate.

The meeting was then adjourned for the applicant & members of the public to comment.

Firstly, Phillip Prosser (Highwood Homes) explained that Highwood was a high quality, award-winning operator who fully supported this application.

Mrs Ellis argued that this was the last brownfield site in Liphook & was needed to provide commercial work for local people.

Mrs Gatcombe stated that she had worked in the care industry & felt there was a lack of respite care for the elderly in Liphook. She argued that this would be a good location as residents would prefer to see people/activity rather than scenery.

Mr Ellis claimed that Liphook was now in the same position as six years ago when Blue Harbour Properties obtained permission for a nursing home & then just sat on it for five years, enabling Taylor Wimpey to build houses. He added that there were plenty of local job vacancies in the care industry with 13 advertisements in this week's Liphook Herald alone. Liphook needed small units for people to start their own business & employ local people.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan proposed that the Parish Council should object on the grounds that the developer should pursue the marketing of the site for commercial employment use more diligently. A vote was taken (all in favour).

Decision:

Object as Parish Council considers that Taylor Wimpey should continue to actively market site for commercial employment use.

80/14.12

28790/007 **Fell sycamore & prune sycamore - 5 Chappell Close, Liphook** **Mrs Phipps**
Dr M Evans

Dr Evans explained that the trees were in the rear garden of 5 Chappell Close, but were overhanging the garden of the applicant, who lived at 17 Canada Way. The proposal was to fell one tree which was damaged, & to significantly crown-lift the other to 8/9m above the garden of 17 Canada Way. The owner had no objections & there would be no impact on their privacy. Dr Evans considered that the work would change the view from Chappell Close, but had no objections as he considered that they would grow back in time.

Decision: No objections.

81/14 **ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS**

81/14.1

29726/009 **Lawful development certificate for existing use of land as a** **Mr Wright**
Cllr Robinson **garden - Cedar House, Hewshott Lane, Liphook**

Cllr Robinson had visited the site, but had been unable to enter as the applicant had stated that it was not convenient. Cllr Robinson was therefore unable to comment on the application.

Decision: No comment.

81/14.2

34310/021 **Pre-decision amendment (additional information)** **Easterton Ltd**
 /022 **- change of use of land from agricultural to suitable**
Cllr Mrs J Kirby **alternative natural green space (SANGS)/outline**
 application - phase 1 of 155 dwellings & additional
 phases for a total of 175 dwellings with associated
 access, car parking & public open space, following
 demolition of five dwellings - land at Lowsley Farm,
 Lark Rise, Liphook

Cllr Mrs Kirby advised that the amendment was in the form of additional information pertaining to the ecological management strategy, visitor survey report, revised SANG design, reptile survey report & an interim bat survey summary. From reading these additional documents, she understood that there was no change to the proposed SANG location but HCC had appeared to accept the revised visibility splays, the contaminated material had been removed from the site & the applicant had accepted a Grampian style condition after discussions with Thames Water. The applicant had also accepted a 60:40 split for affordable housing for the first 155 dwellings, & a 70:30 split thereafter. However, she did not consider that this overcame the original Parish Council objections to the re-location of the SANG site. She added that the Visitor Report was misleading & the draft 106 requirements were not clear. She proposed making no changes to the Parish Council's original objections to both applications. A vote was taken (all in favour).

Decision: Original Parish Council objections still stand.

81/14.3

**36757/005/LBC Creation of doorway between 5 & 7 Haslemere Rd
Cllr Mrs J Kirby - 7 Haslemere Rd, Liphook**

**Mr & Mrs
Butler**

Cllr Mrs Kirby advised that the Parish Council had raised no objections to the original application when it had been discussed at the March meeting. However, the building was listed so an identical listed building application had to be made.

Decision: No objections.

81/14.4

**39607/006 New dormer window & ancillary out-building - Cypress,
Cllr Robinson Hill House Hill, Liphook**

Mr Probert

Cllr Robinson reported that the application was for a dormer window to provide light to a loft room to be used just for storage & a free-standing garden store/open log store with games room above. The latter would be of wooden construction with an open stairway to the end of the building, & be positioned at the end of the garden. All windows would overlook the applicant's own garden & the size/construction of the garden store should preclude its use as a separate dwelling.

Decision: No objections.

82/14 **RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)**

These were noted.

83/14 **EHDC PLANNING COMMITTEE - 17.7.2014 Hill Top Stables, Devil's Lane, Liphook (52747/008)**

It was noted that the Parish Council had strongly objected to this application to remove the original conditions to allow an extended time limit & use by non-dependants. It was agreed that Cllr Croucher, who had represented the Parish Council at the earlier EHDC Planning Committee meeting when the original application was discussed, would represent the Parish Council at this EHDC Planning Committee meeting as well.

84/14 **STREET NAMING**

Development at Silent Garden, Portsmouth Rd, Liphook (26295/007)

The developer was proposing to name the main roads as Silent Gardens Road/Close etc. & had asked the Parish Council to select a name for the secondary roads from a choice of Thompson, Fogarty or Furlongers. It was suggested that the secondary roads could be named Rudgard (after Tony Rudgard's father, Harold, who was a railway engineer drafted in to train the army at Longmoor during WW1 & will be featuring in the BBC1 series "The Railway War"). This was agreed & Furlonger was chosen as the reserve name for secondary roads.

85/14 **LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATES FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS**

Fir Tree Cottage, Ludshott Common, Woolmer Lane, Bramshott (20808/007)

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

6 Quebec Close, Liphook

It was noted that an application had been made to ascertain whether planning permission was required to demolish an existing conservatory & replace it with a garden room.

86/14

PLANNING APPEALS

Bramshott Place Phase 4 site, King George's Drive Liphook (54599; 54599/001)

It was noted that appeals by Helical (Liphook) Ltd (re: refusal of planning permission for 40 cottages, 64-bed care home, extension to existing clubhouse & temporary construction access route) would be determined at an Inquiry, understood to be scheduled for January 2015, & that the original Parish Council comments (see Appendix 2) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

The meeting was then adjourned for Mrs Ogden & Mr Burrell (Bramshott Place Association) to speak. Mr Burrell stated that Bramshott Place would be represented at the appeal, but they had not as yet decided whether to appoint an advocate & invoke Rule 6 status. Mrs Ogden added that they wanted to work with the Parish Council & EHDC. Cllr Jerrard asked what form the Inquiry would take, & Mrs Ogden advised that it would be a Full Public Inquiry. Cllr Jerrard advised that anybody could attend & request to speak at the Inspector's discretion, but Rule 6 meant they must be allowed to speak. The meeting was then reconvened

Cllr Maroney agreed to represent the Parish Council at the Inquiry. The Chairman stated that it was important that as many councillors as possible attend, & that the Parish Council should request that it was held in Liphook. A vote was taken (all in favour).

87/14

DEVELOPMENT WORKING PARTY

Cllr Jordan reported that the next meeting was scheduled for 18 July when the WP would reflect on the LIPS consultation & how to proceed from there. There was a need for officer input & that would also be addressed at the meeting.

88/14

EHDC LIPS CONSULTATION (17.6.2014)

The Chairman referred to the consultation exercise & stated that the Parish Council should send a formal response to EHDC. She had produced a draft summary of the Parish Council's interpretation, which she circulated to members & read out extracts. She claimed that the results of the LIPS consultations would become a material consideration when determining applications outside the SDNP, & would ultimately be fed into the East Hampshire Local Plan (Part 2): Allocations. She claimed that Liphook had significant development constraints; including being partially in the SDNP & having the six main routes into Liphook running through a Conservation Area with a significant number of listed buildings. Five of the SHLAA sites were in the SDNP & two others had well organised Action Groups. She stated that the Parish Council had expected the consultation process to be democratic, professional, informative & consistent, but considered that the Liphook consultation had failed to meet these expectations & gave examples of how poorly the exhibition was conducted compared to an earlier one held at Four Marks. She pointed out that the exhibition at Four Marks had been held over two days, attendees were registered/given one sticker each & the Ward Councillor had arranged an earlier meeting with the community to explain the SHLAA sites. Additionally Four Marks did not have the added complication of being adjacent to the SDNP.

Cllr Jordan stated that they did approve the process in principle at the WP meeting, but not the detail.

Cllr Robinson claimed that it was a pointless exercise as it had not been controlled.

Cllr Maroney added that it had just led to confusion amongst the public.

Cllr Jordan stated that speed had been of the essence.

Cllr Croucher had attended the WP meeting & advised that members had been led to believe that consultations had been conducted successfully elsewhere in the District; they had accepted this & agreed to the proposed consultation, assuming that information would be made available about all the sites.

Cllr Jordan considered that any exercise should have been for all of Liphook, including the SDNP.

The Chairman advised that officers were telling members of the public that it was just EHDC looking for sites & that the SDNP officer was advising people not to place stickers in the SDNP as it was not seeking housing allocation sites.

The meeting was adjourned to allow the public to speak.

Firstly, Cllr Moulard (EHDC) explained that EHDC had not described the LIPS process as a precise science, in fact Chris Murray (EHDC Planning Manager) had used the words “getting down & dirty”. Just before the LIPS meeting the SDNPA had announced that stickers should not be put on the SDNP area, although Sandy Hopkins (EHDC Chief Executive) considered that this was not acceptable. The report on the Liphook LIPS had not yet been produced. He added that the Planning Committee was to be re-vamped, extra training given to councillors & £200,000 allocated to funding appeals. There was due to be a summit conference between the leaders/chief executives of the two authorities to thrash out the boundary issues.

Mr Halliday considered that the process had been quite well controlled & successful.

Mr Curry claimed the process worked well, but was probably not very accurate & should be redone.

Mr Ellis claimed that everyone had wanted to put their stickers on Bohunt Manor, but had not been allowed to do so.

Cllr Jerrard claimed that the process had been completely flawed as there was no record of who the attendees were/where they lived & so it wasn't known whether they were representative of the Liphook population. The exercise should be redone properly; otherwise the results should be ignored.

Mr Cameron claimed that the Parish Council were perceived to be involved as the event had been held at LMC.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Evans stated that the Parish Council could do a better job & suggested organising a form to collect the views of the people of Liphook.

Cllr Jordan considered that the exercise should be re-run after the EHDC/SDNPA meeting had been held as the current results would be flawed due to the lack of control & the interference by the SDNP officer.

The Chairman proposed that she draft a response to EHDC for circulation/approval by members. A vote was taken (all in favour).

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10.25pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 18 August 2014.

Signed
Presiding Chairman

ORIGINAL PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS (23.9.2013)

54599 Cllrs M Croucher /D Jerrard <u>Decision:</u>	Temporary construction access route - Bramshott Place Phase 4 site, King George's Drive, Liphook 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).	Helical (Liphook) Ltd
54599/001 Cllrs M Croucher /D Jerrard <u>Decision:</u>	40 cottages, 64-bed care home with associated bin stores, car parking, garages, ground modelling, landscaping & access, & extension to existing club house - Bramshott Place Phase 4 site, King George's Drive, Liphook Strongly object to this application on the following grounds: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Helical (Liphook) Ltd