



BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK PARISH COUNCIL

www.bramshottandliphook-pc.gov.uk

Mr A S R GROVES
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 8.00PM IN THE HASKELL CENTRE, MIDHURST ROAD, LIPHOOK ON MONDAY 21 APRIL 2008.

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs A James (Chairman), Cllr J Carne, Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr P Jordan & Cllr N Newman. Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden), Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer), six members of the public & one member of the press also attended.

34/08 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman asked those present to switch off mobile phones, pointed out the fire exits & made people aware of the loop system.

35/08 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

were received from Cllr M Croucher & Cllr P Wilson.

36/08 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 17 MARCH 2008

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

37/08 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chairman advised that EHDC's site visit to the land adjacent to the OSU site/Beaver Industrial Estate (Minute 31/08) had been cancelled because the application had been withdrawn.

38/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman declared a personal, but not prejudicial, interest in the application for tree work at 41 Chiltley Way (34298/2/TPO/AMP) as the applicant was married to the Assistant Clerk. She also declared that, as a District Councillor, she reserved the right to express opinions at District-level based on all the information received & put before the South Planning Committee, whereas at this meeting she would be acting as a Parish Councillor.

Cllr Mrs Easton declared a personal, but not prejudicial, interest in the application for tree work at Bolands Springs, Hewshott Lane (34693/7/CAT/AMP) as the applicant was a friend.

39/08 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

Public Questions.

The Chairman offered to adjourn the meeting for public questions about items not on the agenda, but there were no questions raised.

Members'/Public Participation.

The Chairman explained that any members of the Committee who had a prejudicial interest in business being transacted could exercise their right to make representations, answer questions, or give evidence. However, as no members had any prejudicial interest they did not need to exercise this right, & no members of the public had need to make representations, answer questions or give evidence. The Chairman invited members of the public to address the Committee about business on the agenda.

40/08 PLANNING APPLICATIONS APPLICANT

40/08.1

**20449/11/FUL/PF Change of use of land to equestrian with retention of field Mr Acott
Cllr N Newman shelter - Conford Park House, Conford**

Cllr Newman stated that the estate had been allowed to deteriorate over the past 15 years. The new owner had been renovating the estate: they had drained & fenced the land, & erected the shelter before realising that they needed planning permission. There were no other stables on the estate, so they could only keep horses if this change of use was permitted. This was only a very small strip of land compared to the whole estate, & would not be commercially viable as agricultural land. The alternatives were to allow the change of use, to let it remain as scrubland or to incorporate it into the garden area. He had no objections to the change of use & was delighted to see the restoration of grazing land.

Decision: No objections but the land should remain within the curtilage of Conford Park House.

40/08.2

**20601/24/FUL/SY Single-storey extension to provide additional day space High Hurlands
Cllr Carne (renewal of 20601/022) - Panda Cottage, High Hurlands Homes
Homes, Gentles Lane, Passfield**

Cllr Carne explained that this was a resubmission of an earlier application which had been granted permission five years ago. The extension had not been built for financial reasons & the permission had expired. High Hurlands was a residential home for severely disabled children/young people. The cottage currently had three rooms, which new regulations dictated were too small, & they therefore needed to extend the cottage. The cottage was well screened & the L-shaped proposed extension had been designed to fit beautifully around an oak tree.

Decision: No objections.

40/08.3

**22316/2/FUL/RA Detached bungalow & double garage, following demolition Old Thorns Golf
Cllr P Jordan of dwelling - Queens Cottage, Queens Rd, Liphook & Country Club**

Cllr Jordan reminded members that they had seen the original application in January & had not objected. The earlier application had been withdrawn as the increase in the size of the footprint had exceeded the permitted ratio; the applicant having based their calculations on the present size of the existing dwelling, rather than on its original size. They had now downscaled the application considerably by removing the top floor & he fully supported it.

Decision: No objections.

40/08.4

23136/3/ADV/KC Replacement signage - Prince of Wales, Hammer Vale

Mr Tonks

Cllr Mrs B Easton

Cllr Mrs Easton explained that the brewery had changed from Gales to Fullers. The old sign was red & the new one would be green, which members agreed would be an improvement. She added that the old sign was very tatty, & needed replacing anyway.

Decision: No objections.

40/08.5

23717/10/ADV/SY Display of illuminated pole-mounted sign with flags

McCarthy Stone

Cllr Mrs A James - 15 Tower Rd, Liphook

(Devs) Ltd

The Chairman explained that the proposal was for a display board with flag poles & illumination in London Rd (although the site address was Tower Rd). The structure would be over 7m high & the signage would be the usual McCarthy & Stone green with people on.

Mr Walters (20 Tower Rd) objected strongly: the address was wrong, there was no need for an 8m column (Peak Quality Homes had successfully sold homes using a 3.5m sign), it could damage the trees which were essential to the appearance of the area & the idea of illuminating the sign was ridiculous, especially at this time of year.

Mr Roles (48 London Rd) lived almost opposite the site & was concerned about further applications as he claimed that McCarty & Stone normally have flag poles all around their sites.

Miss Steele (70 London Rd) lived opposite the site & was concerned that she would be able to see the structure from her back garden. She claimed that it would be an eyesore & out-of-keeping with the area.

Mr Lowe (54a London Rd) claimed that it would overlook his kitchen/dining room. He was also concerned about tree clearance as he had understood that the tree line was to be maintained.

Cllr Carne asked whether the sign was to be retained permanently, or just while construction was in progress, & what would happen to the base & electricity supply when it was no longer required. The Chairman replied that there was no mention of this in the plans.

Cllr Jordan spoke on behalf of Mr & Mrs Miller (44a London Rd) who had asked him to convey that they considered that it would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring residents.

Decision: Object on the following grounds:

1. strongly object to any illumination;
2. the height of the sign would be out-of-keeping with the village setting of the streetscene - would have no objection to a smaller sign (similar to Peak Quality Homes on adjacent site);
3. object to the permanence of the sign with a concrete base;
4. concrete base could damage tree roots (trees need to be protected as tree line is to be maintained);
5. object to the presence of any flags as the noise from constant wavering would affect the nearby residents of Greenfield Close & 44 - 62 London Rd.

NB: should permission be granted, request that the structure be removed after the properties are sold.

40/08.6

32146/5/FUL/DM Detached dwelling with associated access (reserved matters of 32146/003) - Elmhurst, Passfield Rd, Passfield Primesite Construction
Cllr Mrs A James

The Chairman explained the location of the site & that it had a long history. After a considerable number of applications/discussions, outline permission was granted for a new house on half the plot. This was the detailed application with a key amendment that the garage was to be an open barn adjacent to the new house. This would look more attractive & the garage was in a much better location. The Parish Council had not objected to the outline application & she recommended that it did not object to this one.

Decision: No objections.

40/08.7

33125/17/FUL/DM Single-storey office building - Woolmer Farm, Woolmer Lane, Bramshott Colesfield Farming Partnership
Cllr Carne

Cllr Carne reported that the site was adjacent to Ludshott Manor & could also be reached using the long farm track from Tunbridge Lane. It was in the middle of a working farm, opposite Woolmer Farm House. The current office was housed in a cramped dilapidated caravan, & the applicant wanted to replace this with a slightly larger purpose-built office, which would take up the same area as the caravan. It would only be seen by Woolmer Farm House & he could not see any reason to object provided sufficient conditions were imposed on the usage.

Mrs Herriott (Woolmer Farm House) stated that the change would result in an increase in floorspace from 21 sq m to 45 sq m & that the office would have the same size frontage as her house. The office was originally in a small caravan which was replaced by the current mobile home, which had been allowed to become dilapidated. She understood that the requirement for toilet/washing facilities for staff had arisen quite a few years ago, & queried why the applicant had waited so long & whether there was a need for such an impressive office, especially as land around the farm & the cattle were being sold off.

Decision: No objections provided that there is a proven need at this time for an office building of this size. Should the farm cease to have a commercial use, the office building should be removed. In any event, the office building must not be used for residential purposes at any time.

40/08.8

33887/12/FUL/DM Shed to rear - 6 Midhurst Rd, Liphook Mrs Wu
Cllr Mrs A James

The Chairman explained that the site was originally a butcher's shop, & that the flat above was residential & in separate ownership. When the butchers closed, the downstairs became a restaurant called Bibi Ana's. The licensing application for Bibi Ana's was granted with a number of restrictions imposed to protect the amenities of the flat above. One of these conditions was that the rear courtyard should not be used. The restaurant had changed hands & was now owned by the applicant, who wanted to open it as a Chinese restaurant. They had carried out various alterations without planning permission & stop notices had been issued. They had originally applied for permission for this shed in March 2007 & the Parish Council had strongly objected as the licensing agreement had stated that there should be no use of the courtyard at any time & it would result in the loss of parking spaces required under a previous change of use permission. The only change was that this application was for a smaller shed, & she therefore recommended that the Parish Council should object as before.

Cllr Jordan stated that he could see the need for two storage areas; one for storing food & one for storing items that could not be stored with food. He argued that the shop had been vacant for some time & was an eyesore, & thought that the Parish Council should not object in order to allow the business to operate.

Cllr Newman pointed out that the resident in the flat above was there first & their amenities should be protected. He added that he did not think that food could be kept in the store as it was adjacent to a toilet, & thought that the applicant should redesign the interior to include sufficient internal storage space.

Cllr Mrs Easton agreed that the amenities of the resident in the flat above should be considered as Chinese restaurants did tend to open for long hours & be open very late at night.

The Chairman proposed continuing with the earlier objection. A vote was taken (2 for; 3 against).

There was further discussion about the likely usage of the shed & resultant disturbance to the resident in the above flat.

Decision: No objections provided use of shed restricted to 8am - 6pm Monday to Saturday, as the licensing agreement stated that the courtyard should not be used at anytime.

40/08.9

**35885/3/FUL/KC Conservatory (orangery) to rear - Hazelbank, Covers Lane, Mr & Mrs
Cllr Mrs B Easton Hammer Vale Harding**

Cllr Mrs Easton stated that this would be a small extension/orangery to the rear of the property. The only house to overlook it would be the adjacent new house, & it would only be seen from a window which did not have planning permission.

Decision: No objections.

40/08.10

**37886/1/VOC/AE Relaxation of Condition 3 of 37886 - to allow use of barn for Mr Northcott
Cllr Mrs A James parking - Foley Farm, Foley Estate Lane, Liphook**

The Chairman explained that the original permission for the conversion of disused outbuildings to cottages for holiday lets included a condition that required the demolition of two disused barns. The applicant now wanted this condition removed so that the barns could be used as garages. The Chairman supported this as she considered that the barns looked far more attractive than parked cars.

Decision: No objections.

40/08.11

**38818/3/FUL/AE Dwelling, following demolition of garages - 1 Meadow Close, Mr & Mrs
Cllr Mrs A James Liphook Hall**

The Chairman explained that this was a variation on a permission granted last year for a house with a garage & home office in a semi-basement. The house would have had three storeys, but the third floor would only have been visible from the side; from the front it would have appeared to be a two-storey house. There was a new owner who wanted to change the roofline & move the parking area to the side. She could see no reason to object as the house would look the same from the front.

Decision: No objections.

40/08.12

39333/1/FUL/SY **Increase roof height, dormer windows to front & rear, & two-storey extension to front - 2a Dryden Way, Liphook** **Mr Gordon**
Cllr N Newman

Cllr Newman explained that this was a detached house facing Headley Rd, enclosed by a conifer screen on three sides. The side of the house faced Dryden Way &, entering from there, it was difficult to know where the front of the house was. The proposal was to raise the roof height to create extra bedrooms & introduce a large glass porch on the Headley Rd side to create a focal point. It did not really affect any neighbours & would enhance the appearance of the house.

Decision: No objections.

40/08.13

49681/3/FUL/AE **Two dwellings with garages, following demolition of existing bungalow - Maryland, Pines Rd, Liphook** **Peak Quality Homes Ltd**
Cllr J Carne

Cllr Carne reminded members that they had seen an earlier version of this application last month. The Parish Council had objected strongly & the application had subsequently been withdrawn. It had now been resubmitted with a slightly lower roof height, but it was still very large & out-of-keeping with the surrounding houses. He considered that the earlier objections were still valid & recommended continuing to object for the same reasons.

The Chairman pointed out that the design was actually much poorer, especially the flank walls of the two side elevations.

Decision: Strongly object as:

1. out-of-character with the streetscene;
2. height, mass & bulk excessive compared to adjacent properties;
3. roof height could lead to further intensification;
4. over-development of hard-standing in relation to plot size which would interfere with natural drainage;
5. amended design totally unacceptable, especially the two side elevations.

TREE APPLICATIONS

40/08.14

34298/2/TPO/AMP **Prune elm & six holly - 41 Chiltley Way, Liphook** **Mr Haussauer**
Dr M Evans

Dr Evans reported that the proposal was to prune the rear overgrown boundary hedge in order to reform it. The elms were dead, the holly had not been pruned for some time & had reverted to a wild form, & laurel (not covered by the blanket TPO) had invaded & naturalised. Both the holly & the laurel were detrimentally affecting a mature oak, & he recommended agreeing to the proposal.

Decision: No objections.

40/08.15

34693/7/CAT/AMP **Prune 3 oak & conifer, & fell ash & pine - Boland Springs, Hewshott Lane, Liphook** **Mrs Redrupp**
Dr M Evans

Dr Evans did not object to the application which was for multiple works: three oaks on the western boundary needed re-pollarding; a pine tree needed the height reducing in order to reshape it; an ash with a sparse canopy (possibly due to storm damage) which was in competition with other neighbouring ash trees needed to be felled, as did a Scots pine which was beginning to crowd out another ash.

Decision: No objections.

36982/1/TPO/AMP Fell spruce - 13 Chiltley Way, Liphook

Mrs Loftis

Dr M Evans

Dr Evans explained that the spruce was very close to the house & had previously been crown-lifted to around 4m. It was an established tree, in good health, but of low amenity value & probably not covered by the blanket TPO. The garden was quite wooded & he had no objections provided that it was replaced with a suitable ornamental tree.

Decision: No objections provided replaced with suitable ornamental tree.

41/08 ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS

There were none.

42/08 RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (Appendix 1)

These were noted.

43/08 PLANNING APPEALS

43/08.1 Bohunt Manor, Portsmouth Rd, Liphook (39366/7/ECOU)

It was noted that the appeal by B G & E M Langdon (against an Enforcement Notice issued for the change of use of land by the siting of two caravans for residential use without planning permission) would be dealt with by the written procedure. The Parish Council had not been involved in the issuing of the Enforcement Notice, but it was agreed that they should support EHDC. It was agreed that the Clerk would write to the Planning Inspectorate (by 1 May 2008), on behalf of the Parish Council, to

“Strongly object to the residential occupancy of the two caravans at Bohunt Manor as:

- 1. object in principle as the appellants should have applied for permission for residential occupancy of the caravans prior to installation;*
- 2. permission for use could lead to two permanent dwellings in the countryside where they would not normally be allowed.”*

43/08.2 Greengates, land west of Pine Bungalow, Longmoor Rd, Liphook (34436/11/VBPC)

It was noted that the appeal by Mr Light (against an Enforcement Notice issued for the erection of a building & the construction of a hard-surfaced area without planning permission) had been dismissed & the enforcement notice upheld (with corrections).

44/08 EAST HAMPSHIRE CORE STRATEGY - ISSUES & OPTIONS

The Chairman reminded members about EHDC’s on-line consultation & advised that responses needed to be submitted by 6 May 2008. The deadline had been extended in order for an article to appear in Partners magazine. The Issues & Options documents were available on-line & from the Parish Office. This was very important & was the time for Liphook residents to have their say about the future of Liphook.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 12 May 2008.

Signed
Presiding Chairman