



# **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 HASKELL CENTRE, MIDHURST ROAD, LIPHOOK  
ON MONDAY 8 DECEMBER 2014.**

## **MINUTES**

### **PRESENT WERE:**

Cllr Mrs J Kirby (Chairman), Cllr M Croucher, Cllr R Evans, Cllr P Jordan, Cllr T Maroney, Cllr Ms J Poole & Cllr P Robinson. Mrs G Spencer (Administration Officer) & one member of the press also attended, together with Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr Mrs L Ashton (EHDC), Mr S Thomas (Assistant Parish Tree Warden) & 21 members of the public for parts of the meeting.

### **143/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

She 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 could be adjourned to allow the public to comment on any material planning matters relating to that application prior to the meeting being reconvened for the Committee to agree their comments for submission to EHDC/SDNPA.

### **144/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr B Mouland (EHDC).

### **145/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **146/14 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 10 NOVEMBER 2014**

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

### **147/14 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**148/14 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION**

Public Questions (items not on the agenda).

Mr Groves (6 The Grove, Liphook) asked when the Parish Council was intending to put the formation of a Neighbourhood Plan on the agenda in order to allow parishioners to have some input. Cllr Croucher replied that it would be on the agenda for the next full Parish Council meeting on 16 December 2014.

Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 143/14).

**149/14 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**APPLICANT**

**149/14.1**

**20449/017 Two-storey side extension & addition of entrance porch Mr & Mrs  
Cllr R Evans - Conford Park House, Conford Rd, Conford Acott**

Cllr Evans stated that this was a massive house in a large estate. The Parish Council had approved substantial additions in the form of a health club, extensions & staff accommodation at the start of the year. The applicant now wanted even more additions & he considered that it was a classic case of over-development.

Cllr Jordan stated that, from a planning perspective, the Parish Council should look at this proposal in isolation.

Cllr Evans recommended objecting on the grounds of over-development. A vote was taken (one in favour; five against).

**Decision:** No objections.

**149/14.2**

**20449/018 Conversion/extensions to existing staff accommodation to Mr & Mrs  
Cllr R Evans provide ancillary leisure facilities & link extension to pool Acott  
building - Conford Park House, Conford Rd, Conford**

Cllr Evans repeated his concerns that this represented a classic case of over-development.

Cllr Ms Poole argued that the proposal would enhance the appearance & facilities of the house.

Cllr Evans recommended objecting on the grounds of over-development. A vote was taken (one in favour; five against).

**Decision:** No objections.

**149/14.3**

**21026/045 Provision of area for external equipment & heat pump Bohunt School  
Cllr P Jordan equipment - Bohunt Community School, Longmoor Rd, & Centre  
Liphook**

Cllr Jordan advised that the application comprised a highly technical report & he considered that the Parish Council could not really judge whether the noise level would affect surrounding residents.

Cllr Robinson suggested that the school should put forward a strategy to reduce congestion in The Square next time they put forward an application for a classroom, but this was not an appropriate application.

Cllr Mrs Kirby added that the Parish Council should consider the wider implications for all applications.

**Decision:** No comment.

#### 149/14.4

**22789/006**

**Pre-decision amendment (further information)**

**Bloor Homes  
(Southern)**

**Cllrs Mrs J Kirby - residential development comprising 100 dwellings &  
/Mrs B Easton associated public open space, following change of use of  
land & demolition of existing buildings - Poultry Farm,  
Chiltley Lane, Liphook**

Cllr Mrs Kirby advised that Natural England had objected to the proposed green space as they considered that the lack of natural green space would impact on the SPA. The applicant had proposed three measures to overcome this, & Natural England needed certainty of delivery so that they could remove their objections.

Cllr Robinson advised that he & Cllr Jordan had met two representatives of the applicant at Radford Park. They had looked at the improved access track & had noted the amount of work which still needed to be done. Cllr Jordan added that, although Radford Park was some considerable distance from the application site, it was within the Parish.

Cllr Mrs Kirby advised that the Parish Council would be pleased that the developer's contribution would be kept in the parish should EHDC decided to grant permission. The applicant had confirmed that the money would be paid directly to the Parish Council. She added that the amendment was merely the provision of additional information.

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

Firstly, Mr Haliday (Chiltley Farm Action Group) claimed that the additional information did not make the proposed development sustainable & he still considered that it was not wanted by residents.

Mr McKenzie (owner of the Poultry Farm) advised that he had wanted to put Radford Park on the agenda in order to benefit the parish rather than the money going elsewhere.

Mr Ellis questioned the fact that the Parish Council had not objected to the application & were now about to benefit from it. Cllr Mrs Kirby replied that the system of developer contributions was quite normal. Cllr Jordan added that he had voted against the application at the time, but as custodians of Radford Park the Parish Council should accept contributions towards improvements.

Mr Haliday asked what impact a Neighbourhood Plan might have on this application. Cllr Mrs Kirby advised that she could not comment until the Parish Council had decided whether or not to go ahead with a Neighbourhood Plan.

Mr Haliday added that EHDC had not included the Poultry Farm site in their Allocation Plan. Cllr Mrs Kirby replied that the Allocation Plan had nothing to do with the Parish Council.

Mr Groves asked whether the Parish Council had a pecuniary interest in the application. Cllr Mrs Kirby replied that none of the individual councillors did.

The meeting was then reconvened.

**Decision:** No comment on this amendment.

#### 149/14.5

**23525/005**

**Extension to side & dormer window to rear - Amberley,  
Cllr P Robinson Pines Rd, Liphook**

**Mr Marsall**

Cllr Robinson reported that the property was a substantial chalet bungalow with two upstairs bedrooms accessed by a spiral staircase. The proposal would add two further bedrooms with a conventional staircase, making a total of six bedrooms. Although the footprint would be only marginally increased, he felt that for the size of the plot this was probably over-development. The proposed dormer windows would look directly into the adjacent property & he therefore recommended objecting in view of the loss of privacy. A vote was taken (all in favour).

**Decision:** Object on grounds of loss of privacy for adjacent property, Laurels,  
& possible over-development.

**149/14.6**

**26854/019**                                      **Replacement stabling & storage building, following**                                      **Ms Forbes**  
**Cllr M Croucher**                                      **demolition of existing - land north of Westering & west**  
**of Church Rd, Bramshott**

Cllr Mrs Kirby advised that she lived near to the site, but had no pecuniary interest in it.  
 Cllr Croucher reported that the site was a field which used to be a nursery & had a contentious planning history. The applicant was seeking to demolish the existing barn & replace it with a new building further out into the field. It would be a conventional timber stable comprising a fodder store & two loose boxes, & would be a significant improvement provided the entire original barn was removed.  
 Cllr Mrs Kirby considered that the barn was less intrusive on the boundary of the field & added that the field was twice the size when the original permission was granted.  
 Cllr Croucher recommended not objecting provided all of the original buildings were removed. A vote was taken (all in favour).

**Decision:**                                      No objections provided that all existing buildings on the site are demolished & no other buildings are erected on the site.

**149/14.7**

**29241/001**                                      **Single-storey rear extension - 33 Bircholt Rd, Liphook**                                      **Mr & Mrs**  
**Cllr Ms J Poole**                                      **Cosier**

Cllr Ms Poole reported that there was currently a small extension, about half the width of the building. The new extension would be across the whole width of the building over an existing patio & would enlarge the current kitchen. There would be no impact on neighbours & none of them objected. Other houses in the area had similar extensions, & Cllr Ms Poole considered that it was perfectly reasonable & would improve the use of the house.

**Decision:**                                      No objections.

**149/14.8**

**33993/077**                                      **Variation of Condition 13 (relating to noise) of permission**                                      **Taylor Wimpey**  
**Cllr P Jordan**                                      **33993/072 for residential development comprising**                                      **UK Ltd & Stax**  
**62 dwellings with associated access, parking & open space**                                      **Development Ltd**  
**- former OSU site Area B, Midhurst Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Jordan read out the covering letter, submitted with the application, which explained that the applicant was seeking to have the clause in the condition removed which related to when the noise mitigation measures were tested. This was so they could sell some of the houses prior to the final tests being conducted. Cllr Jordan considered that this would be perfectly reasonable.

**Decision:**                                      No objections.

**38580/001                      Six detached dwellings, following demolition of existing                      Mrs O'Neill**  
**Cllr M Croucher    dwelling - Longsdon, 46 Haslemere Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Croucher advised that this was an outline application for six dwellings to replace the existing large house which was situated in a very large plot. The six new dwellings would have either three or four bedrooms & would be located along a cul-de-sac running the length of the plot.

Cllr Maroney asked whether the houses would overlook adjacent back gardens; Cllr Croucher confirmed that they would.

Cllr Jordan queried whether the access road or the new houses would be closest to the adjacent properties; Cllr Croucher advised that the access road would be closest.

Cllr Mrs Kirby asked whether there would be any affordable housing; Cllr Croucher advised there would not be.

Cllr Robinson was concerned about highway safety & wanted assurance that the access would be safe. Cllr Croucher advised that the proposal was to use the existing access, which was in the 30mph section of Haslemere Rd. Cllr Jordan added that this was in-line with sites on Longmoor Rd & London Rd, all of which had more houses.

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

Firstly, Mrs Payne (44 Haslemere Rd) advised that all the surrounding residents were objecting for good planning reasons. She was concerned that there were only twelve parking spaces & none for visitors, making it likely that parking would spill out onto the Haslemere Rd, where it would be on a converse bend opposite to the entrance to the Recreation Ground. The houses would be on very small plots, very close to each other, & would not be in-keeping with the area; building two houses instead of six would be more in-keeping, but it seemed that the intention was to build as many houses as possible in a cheap build in order to maximise profits.

Mr Moore (purchasing 48 Haslemere Rd) considered that the development would constitute a gross invasion of privacy to the surrounding houses, particularly if the high hedges, which were in the ownership of the applicant, were to be removed.

Mrs Moody (present owner of 48 Haslemere Rd) was concerned about highway safety; she claimed that cars often travelled along Haslemere Rd at 50/60mph & as there was no pavement on that side it was necessary to cross the road which was particularly dangerous because of the bend & the speed of the traffic.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Jordan considered that, should the application be allowed, the beech hedge should be retained & a play area provided.

Cllr Croucher recommended objecting for all the reasons raised. A vote was taken (all in favour).

**Decision:**

Object on the following grounds:

1. over-development of site;
2. density of houses too high;
3. detrimental to character of neighbourhood;
4. loss of privacy for neighbouring properties;
5. insufficient parking provision;
6. concerns about highway/pedestrian safety.

However, should permission be granted, beech hedge should be retained & play area provided.

#### 149/14.10

**49142/003**                      **Two-storey detached dwelling, following demolition of**                      **Mr & Mrs**  
**Cllr Mrs B Easton** **existing dwelling - Old Forge Farm Cottage, Conford Rd,**                      **Glazier**  
**Conford**

Cllr Mrs Easton advised that the property was accessed via a track alongside Conford Village Hall. It was close to the river & opposite National Trust land. A similar application had been refused in 2006 as the site was in a rural area where restrictive planning policies applied (Policy H16) & in a high risk flood zone. There had been subsequent applications for extensions, but now the applicant wanted to return to the original proposal. They had not taken pre-planning advice, & she considered that it would be over-development & out-of-character with the neighbouring houses.

Cllr Robinson asked whether possible flooding was an issue; Cllr Mrs Easton replied that Thames Water had not objected provided it was built in the corner of the site where the current house was situated.

Cllr Mrs Easton proposed objecting as it would constitute over-development under Policy H16. A vote was taken (six in favour; one against).

**Decision:**                      Object on grounds of over-development contrary to Policy H16.

#### 149/14.11

**55200/003**                      **Replacement detached dwelling - Southlands, Limes Close,**                      **Mr Prisgrove**  
**Cllr P Robinson**                      **Bramshott**

Cllr Robinson reported that this was his third visit to the site & on each occasion he had been unable to speak to the owner or the developer. The building was partly completed & the site secured & unoccupied. The modifications proposed, which had the benefit of pre-planning advice, referred to a change of window design at the rear gable end. Previously it would have been completely glazed, but the Parish Council had not objected as the window only overlooked the applicant's garden. It had now been reduced to a smaller size, so there was no reason to object.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

#### 149/14.12

**55909**                      **Construction of multi-use games area with associated paths**                      **Property Services,**  
**Cllr T Maroney**                      **/fencing - Liphook Junior School, Avenue Close, Liphook**                      **Hants CC**

Cllr Maroney advised that the application was for a 1,135 sq. m synthetic grass court in the north-east corner of the site, with a 3m fence & a 3m wide access pathway. It was required in order to provide an all year round play area as the current playing fields were very boggy, particularly in winter. The site would be screened from houses to the north & the west by a small copse. The all-weather surface would be the size of two five-a-side football pitches, with the option of a larger joint pitch for older children. Multi-use options would include tennis & netball, & the facility would be available for community use at weekends & in school holidays. Cllr Maroney considered it to be an essential facility that would benefit both the children & the wider community.

Cllr Robinson asked whether it would compromise the drive-in drop-off area which Cllr Cowper was proposing; Cllr Maroney confirmed that it would not.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

## TREE APPLICATIONS

149/14.13

**37512/007**                      **Fell two oaks - The Old Mill, Tunbridge Lane, Bramshott**                      **Mr Airey**  
**Cllr Mrs J Kirby**  
**/Mr S Thomas**

Mr Thomas stated that this was a beautiful property with the River Wey running through it. There were two oaks which the owner thought were dangerous & he wanted to fell & replace them. One was a prominent tree beside a public footpath, which the applicant claimed had heart rot fungus. There was however no evidence of heart rot; the bark appeared intact & the tree structurally sound. Mr Thomas recommended delaying action until EHDC had assessed the tree & suggesting that crown cleaning would benefit the tree. The other oak was evidently at the end of life & in a state of decay.

**Decision:**                      Object to felling of T1 (subject to EHDC assessment of heart rot condition) as appears structurally sound - crown cleaning would be beneficial if tree not felled.  
No objection to removal of T2 provided replaced with similar tree as tree is evidently at end of life & in state of decay.

149/14.14

**38775/003**                      **Prune sycamore - 35 Ontario Way, Liphook**                      **Mrs Horn**  
**Cllr Mrs J Kirby**  
**/Mr S Thomas**

Mr Thomas reported that this was a very large attractive tree in an area where there were not many trees visible. The tips of the branches were very close to the conservatory & the applicant claimed that they lashed the roof in high winds & lay against it when the foliage was wet. Mr Thomas could see no reason to object to the proposed work.

**Decision:**                      No objections to proposed branch reductions as shown on photographs included in application (i.e. branches should not be cut back to main stem), nor to crown-lifting to 3m to remove epicormic growths/small undeveloped branches.

149/14.15

**55905**                      **Fell common hornbeam - 3 Childerstone Close, Liphook**                      **Mrs Williams**  
**Cllr Mrs J Kirby**  
**/Mr S Thomas**

Cllr Mrs Kirby reported that the applicant claimed to have monitored the tree for twelve months & noted a 50% reduction in the canopy. They claimed that it had honey fungus & wanted to fell the tree & replace it with a similar tree. The tree was in the Conservation Area but not a high amenity tree as it was only visible from the car park of the Social Club. There was some damage to the central part of the trunk, but no visible die-back & some leaves were still attached suggesting that there had been leaf cover during the summer months. Cllr Mrs Kirby recommended objecting to the felling, but stipulating that a replacement must be planted if EHDC granted permission for the tree to be felled.

**Decision:**                      Object to felling of this native tree unless EHDC consider it to be dangerous or dying. If felled, it should be replaced with similar tree (subject to eradication of honey fungus if present).

**150/14            ADDITIONAL APPLICATION**

**55773                    Loft conversion with pitched roof dormers to replace                    Mr Harris**  
**Cllr P Robinson    flat-roof dormer & new detached garage to replace existing**  
**- 62 Church Rd, Bramshott**

Cllr Robinson reported that the property was in a large plot which had been split in two, with 62a Church Rd at the rear. He considered that replacing the front flat roof dormer with two pitched roof dormers would be purely aesthetic & unlikely to increase the accommodation. The existing garage was screened from the road by a mature hedge, & the proposed replacement, although moderately larger to incorporate a workshop, would not be intrusive. Cllr Robinson could see no reason for objecting.

**Decision:**                    No objections.

**151/14            RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)**

These were noted.

**152/14            LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**  
**Moss Cottage, Hill House Hill, Liphook (28417/026)**

It was noted that an application had been made to ascertain whether planning permission was required for single-storey rear, side & front extensions.

**153/14            PLANNING APPEALS**

**26 - 28 Haslemere Rd, Liphook (54992/002; 003)**

It was noted that appeals by Mulberry Property Investments Ltd (re: refusal of planning permission for terrace of three dwellings/pair of semi-detached dwellings, following demolition of existing light industrial building) would be determined by means of written statements. Original Parish Council comments (*“Object to this proposal for three houses plus parking spaces as considered to be overdevelopment in this small area. The access point into Chiltlee Manor Estate is considered dangerous due to poor driver visibility onto a single track road used for residential parking on this private estate. The access point is also onto a public footpath.”* / *“No objections but have some concerns about the access onto Haslemere Rd.”* respectively) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

The meeting was adjourned to allow Ms Doubtfire (Chiltlee Manor Residents Association) to complain about a procedural matter; the applicant had submitted amended plans to the Planning Inspectorate &, as a result, Highways had withdrawn their objections. She did not consider submitting amended plans to the Planning Inspectorate to be the correct procedure & advised that Chiltlee Manor’s consultant would contact the Planning Inspectorate to query the matter. The meeting was then reconvened.

**CONCLUSIONS**

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 9.35pm.  
Confirmed at the meeting held on 12 January 2015.

Signed . . . . .  
Presiding Chairman