



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 TUESDAY 26 MAY 2015.**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs J Kirby (Chairman), Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr Mrs T Jourdan, Cllr Ms J Poole & Cllr E Trotter. Mrs G Spencer (Administration Officer) & one member of the press also attended, together with & Mr Doug Jones (Parish Council Representative for SDNPA) & seven members of the public for parts of the meeting.

60/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman asked for mobile phones to be switched off & 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.

She also advised that there would be a public consultation about the traffic calming proposals in relation to the Lowsley Farm application at the Liphook Millennium Centre on 27 May 2015.

61/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr M Croucher, Cllr Mrs J Ives, Cllr D Jerrard & Mr S Thomas (Parish Tree Warden).

62/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

63/15 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 5 MAY 2015

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

64/15 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

65/15 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Cllr Mrs Kirby proposed Cllr Mrs Easton as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee (seconded by Cllr Trotter). A vote was taken (all in favour).

Decision: Cllr Mrs Easton was elected as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee.

66/15 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

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

Cllr Mrs Kirby introduced Mr Doug Jones, the Parish Council Representative for SDNPA. Mr Jones had been a Parish Councillor for Buriton for several years, & the East Hampshire Parish Council Representative for SDNPA for around three years. His background was in town planning. The SDNPA Planning Committee comprised 27 members, 14 of whom were appointed by each local authority in the Park, six were elected Parish Councillors & seven were appointed by the Secretary of State. The Park covered about 100 miles from Eastbourne to Winchester & was mostly rural. There were around 4,000 planning applications each year, the majority of which were considered under arrangement by the appropriate District Council, based on SDNPA Planning policies. The SDNPA can call in applications if they are considered significant & they would then be put before the SDNPA Planning Committee, which meets on the second Thursday of each month at Midhurst. The policies in the Local Plan were being revised over the next couple of years to produce a document which would supersede all the current plans to generate a common policy for the whole Park. There would be a public consultation in September/October this year & the SDNPA would like feedback from parish councils. There was a Link Officer, called Natalie Fellows, who worked with district & town/parish councils, & she was the appropriate person to contact if councils felt that a particular application should be called in.

Public Participation. Permitted by the Chairman (see Minute 60/15).

67/15 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

APPLICANT

67/15.1

SDNP /14/06426/OUT Cllr Mrs J Kirby	Amendment - up to 140 residential units, farm shop & café, nature reserve area, SANGS area, sustainable drainage infrastructure & associated access works - Bohunt Park, Bohunt Manor, Portsmouth Rd, Liphook	Green Village Investments Ltd
--	--	--

Cllr Mrs Kirby stated that, despite the large amounts of paperwork submitted, the Case Officer had advised that these were relatively minor changes relating to foul drainage/access. She then summarised the Parish Council’s original objections to these aspects of the application. She then reported that the applicant appeared to have abandoned the concept of a living water system with reed beds, & was now proposing an on-site storage solution with a sewerage pumping station adjacent to the car park for the football pitch. Applications in the SDNP are allowed if they are judged as “exceptional” & the applicant was claiming that this proposal was, however she disputed whether it would necessarily qualify as such.

The meeting was adjourned to allow Mr Miller (SOS Bohunt Action Group) to voice the Group’s objections to the amended application, which included the proposed ‘Grampian’ condition for the foul drainage system, the application not counting towards JCS targets, traffic congestion in The Square, & the validity of the documents relating to completed questionnaires/LIPS event. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Mrs Kirby recommended that the Parish Council continued to object as before as the foul drainage arrangements were still unacceptable & the amendments had not addressed the Parish Council concerns about traffic congestion, or the Landscape Officer's concerns about the historic drive not being preserved. A vote was taken (all in favour).

Decision:

Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council continue to object to this application as none of the recently submitted documents have addressed the concerns previously raised by this council; in fact there are now additional concerns. The Parish Council therefore continue to strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons, and the reasons previously submitted:

Foul Drainage

We note that the applicant now proposes on-line storage for foul drainage. The proposal to pump foul drainage into a receiving manhole in Portsmouth Road is unacceptable. This area has been the subject of several sewage flooding incidences and we believe there is inadequate evidence to show that the drainage system could cope with any additional input. It has also already been shown that the current drainage system along Longmoor Road is inadequate for the existing housing let alone approved developments. Similar solutions are being proposed by other developers and the cumulative effect is unacceptable. We therefore object to the proposal for offsite storage in Longmoor Road. We do not believe that a Grampian condition would be appropriate in this instance. We consider the proposal to site storage facilities and pumping station adjacent to the car parking for the football pitch is also inappropriate. There is doubt whether the parking spaces are sufficient for purpose and this would leave no further room for extending the parking. With this level of uncertainty, lack of evidence that this proposal would be sufficient even in the short term together with the negative impact this could have on the National Park we strongly object to this proposal.

Traffic and Access

None of the amendments appear to give confidence that there will be any improvement to safety or to traffic flows. There have been no mitigation measures to address the volume of traffic likely to be generated by this proposed development which have been shown to take the Portsmouth Road roundabout beyond capacity. This application is on the southern side of the Conservation area of The Square and with no alternative route all commuter traffic will have to cross this area to access the two A3 interchanges off the London Road and Longmoor Road. The additional traffic congestion would in turn have a negative impact on the historical centre of our community. The application has not addressed the concerns of the Landscape Office who recommended: "The entrance to the former Manor is an important feature to retain as part of the historic fabric and relationship of the Manor with Portsmouth Road. It would make an attractive route with replacement and succession planting of the tree lines." The applicant does not appear to be able to grasp the concept of the first Statutory Purpose of the National Park which is to "conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and

cultural heritage”. The term “exceptional” has been loosely used by the applicant to describe the design of the proposal. They have also failed to acknowledge or recognise that there have to be exceptional reasons to approve this development within the National Park.

JCS Targets

We are extremely concerned about opinion that the 140 units would count towards the 175 houses allocated for Liphook. We understand that the Duty to Co-operate has been complied with regarding housing allocations for the two planning authorities and that as this application lies within the South Downs National Park the proposal would go towards the SDNP housing allocation and therefore be in addition to the 175 for Liphook.

67/15.2

21026/047 Three-storey classroom building - Bohunt Community Bohunt School Cllr Mrs B Easton School, Longmoor Rd, Liphook & Centre

Cllr Mrs Easton explained that the application was for a new building to house a sixth form college in a separate location adjacent to the existing school site. Permission has been obtained to start a sixth form college in September 2016, & the school estimated reaching full capacity with 500 students by 2019. The new building would be three-storey with 22 classrooms, café/social area, learning resource centre, seminar rooms, prep rooms, offices, toilets & a plant room. The site would be screened on three sides & was not close to either Longmoor Rd or any private houses. The building would be on a lower level than the rest of the school, so although three-storey compared to the rest of the school which was two-storey, it would be perceived as matching the height of the existing rooflines. The proposal was to connect the building to the main drainage system & Thames Water, as statutory consultees, had raised objections. The school intended to work with Thames Water & resubmit this part of the application as an amendment. The Transport Statement claimed that when the college became fully operational approximately 20 additional cars would travel through The Square. Cllr Mrs Easton recommended supporting the application in principle as, although there were negative aspects, the benefits to local students would be enormous, & it would create employment for teachers, technical assistants & ancillary staff.

Cllr Mrs Kirby agreed that Bohunt had an excellent reputation & was a huge asset to the community. She added that the school needed to develop a good Travel Plan & look at the number of buses/where they would park.

Cllr Mrs Easton added that the access would be from the current access road, rather than directly from Longmoor Rd, & the school were prepared to increase the number of buses used & the size of the bus stop areas if necessary. She recommended supporting the application in principle, but stating that the Parish Council had significant concerns about drainage, traffic & buses. A vote was taken (three in favour; one abstention).

Decision: Support the application in principle, but have significant concerns about drainage issues & volume of traffic/buses likely to be generated. Would like to see a detailed Traffic Management/Travel Plan.

67/15.3

21695/007 **Detached car port - Tunbridge House, Tunbridge Lane,** **Mr Akers**
Cllr Ms J Poole **Bramshott**

Cllr Ms Poole reported that the house was very isolated, with no neighbours to speak of. The car port would be set back & there were several of similar design in the area.

Cllr Mrs Kirby considered that it was a large house & the applicant was requesting a relatively small garage.

Decision: No objections.

67/15.4

21722/009 **Lawful Development Certificate - siting of mobile home** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr Mrs J Kirby **within curtilage - 2 Gorse Cottages, Hammer Vale, Liphook** **Jacobs**

Cllr Mrs Kirby advised that this application was just to establish whether or not an application would need to be made, & that the Parish Council would not normally comment. However as this was in the Conservation Area she would like to request that it was not separated from the house & that there was no pollution to the river. A vote was taken (three in favour; one abstention).

Decision: No objections provided used solely as ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling & there is no pollution damage to the River Wey.

67/15.5

21923/001 **Change of use from garage to habitable space & replacement** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr D Jerrard **pitched roof - 81 Haslemere Rd, Liphook** **Seeliger**

Cllr Jerrard was unable to attend the meeting, but had visited the site & given his recommendations. The accommodation was to be used to house the parents of the applicant. The proposed pitched roof would be higher than the present flat roof, & the neighbour objected to the application. He recommended objecting as it would set a precedent & the pitched roof would be out-of-character/detrimental to amenities of the neighbouring property. A vote was taken (all in favour).

Decision: Object as would set precedent for residential development in rear gardens & pitched roof would be out-of-character/detrimental to amenities of the neighbouring property.

67/15.6

24279/009 **Replacement first-floor windows - Jarvis House,** **Talkabout Ltd**
Cllr Ms J Poole **22 The Square, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole reported that the present wooden sash windows were in a poor state of repair & the applicant wanted to replace them with UPVC of the same design. She added that the adjacent shop had were UPVC windows in.

Cllrs Mrs Easton & Mrs Jourdan both objected to the use of this material in the Conservation Area & proposed objecting on the grounds that traditional materials should be used. A vote was taken (all in favour).

Decision: Object as consider that traditional materials should be used in the Conservation Area.

67/15.7

24279/010 **Change of use from office to dental suite - Jarvis House,** **Talkabout Ltd**
Cllr Ms J Poole **22 The Square, Liphook**

Cllr Ms Poole stated that this used to be part of Nationwide, & they now want to change it from office use to a dental suite. She considered that this was reasonable if it secured a tenant.

Decision: No objections.

67/15.8

24569/001 **Two-storey rear extension - 22 Shepherds Way, Liphook** **Mr Salisbury**
Cllr Mrs J Kirby

Cllr Mrs Kirby explained that although this was a four-bedroom house, it only had one bathroom, so the applicant wanted to extend the house to the rear to create a large master bedroom with ensuite bathroom & extend the kitchen below. It would not be a large extension & her only concern was that it would involve a flat-roof extension on the upper floor which would be visible from the street. It would not be possible to have a pitched roof as there would not be sufficient height for a shower.

Cllr Mrs Easton objected to the design in the H9 area & recommended objecting. A vote was taken (all in favour).

Decision: No objections to the extension of the ground-floor, but object to the flat-roof design of the second-floor as would be out-of-character in this H9 area.

67/15.9

29238/019 **Area of hard-standing to be used as overflow carpark** **Churchers College**
Cllr Mrs B Easton - Churchers College Junior School, Midhurst Rd, Liphook

Cllr Mrs Easton advised that this was a retrospective application. The area was needed as the existing playing fields had been compacted by cars parking there on match days. It would not affect anyone else so she could see no reason to object.

Decision: No objections.

67/15.10

55798 **Raised annex roof - The Annexe, Hewshott Grange, Hewshott** **Mr Cottle, Mrs &**
Cllr D Jerrard **Lane, Liphook** **Miss Bird**

Cllr Jerrard had advised the annex was to be used for dependent relatives & visitors & that, as the house was in the middle of nowhere & this would not affect anyone else, there was no reason to object. The meeting was adjourned for the applicant to explain that the gradient of the raised roof would then match the gradient of the house, & the increased height would allow access to the upper floor. It would not be seen from the road as it was behind the garage. The meeting was then reconvened.

Decision: No objections.

CONSERVATION AREA

50047/002 Prune beech - 8 Locke Rd, Liphook
Cllr Mrs J Kirby

**Mr Ffrench-
Lynch**

Cllr Mrs Kirby reported that the tree was actually in Radford Park. The proposal would leave a height of 70ft & there were a great number of other trees in the vicinity, so she could see no reason to object.

Decision: No objections.

71/15 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

Chittlee Manor, (2), Liphook (EH 397 - 25.2.1998)

It was noted that the TPO on a Silver Birch in the car parking area at the rear of the property had been revoked as the tree had been removed (with consent) in 2013.

Land east of Devils Lane, Liphook (EH 982 - 12.5.2015)

It was noted that a provisional TPO had been placed on an oak tree situated in the field boundary adjacent to the highway & to the east of Devils Lane, Liphook.

**72/15 LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
1 Holmehills Cottages, Conford Rd, Conford (30430/007)**

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

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 9.30pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 15 June 2015.

Signed
Presiding Chairman