



BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK PARISH COUNCIL

Mr A S R GROVES
CLERK

Tel: 01428 722988
Fax: 01428 727335
E-mail: blpc@zoom.co.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 CANADA ROOM, LIPHOOK MILLENNIUM CENTRE ON
MONDAY 12 DECEMBER 2005**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs A James (Chairman), Cllr S Coyte, Cllr N Atherden, Cllr M Croucher, Cllr F Dawkins, Cllr L Futcher, Cllr W Ratcliffe & Cllr J Walters. Cllr A Jordan, Cllr J Tough, Mrs C Darter (Parish Tree Warden), Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer), one member of the press & 47 members of the public also attended.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 21 NOVEMBER 2005

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

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Cllr Dawkins inquired whether there had been any further progress on the Village Design Statement (VDS) & the Village Appraisal (Item 3). The Chairman replied that the Village Appraisal had been delayed which had resulted in a corresponding delay in the VDS, which was going to be piggy-backed onto the Appraisal. Cllr Dawkins was concerned that the time-table had not been revised. The Chairman advised that a meeting had been arranged & it was hoped that distribution would take place at some time around the end of January or the beginning of February.

4. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman explained that the Committee would discuss all the applications that members of the public had come to listen to first, taking them in the order in which

they appeared on the agenda. For each application, the relevant committee member would explain the application, then the meeting would be adjourned to allow the public to comment & then reconvened for the Committee to agree their comments for submission to EHDC.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman read out the Declaration & asked whether members had any interests to declare. One declaration was made:

- The Chairman 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.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

**F 21589/48/FUL/JH 34 holiday cabins with associated landscaping
Cllr M Croucher - Old Thorns Golf & Country Club, Weavers
Down, Liphook**

**APPLICANT
London
Kosaido**

Cllr Croucher reported that the cabins would be in two locations, one in the Copse which was beyond the hotel & effectively out-of-site, & the other adjacent to the Bircholt Estate. The buildings would be raised off the ground to allow vegetation & wildlife to exist underneath them. He added that the Parish Council had received many letters of objection to this application.

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

Firstly, Mr Leigh (6 Fairway Close) pointed out that the site was outside the settlement boundary. He claimed that the large, house-sized cabins on stilts would be an eye-sore, & if they were all full would result in around 200 people being on the site, which could increase to 300 if the other application for the hotel extension & conference centre was also granted permission. He was also concerned about the impact on local wildlife, the safety of families in the middle of a golf course, noise late at night as occupants return to their cabins, the loss of leisure facilities for local residents & claimed that the traffic assessment was not realistic.

Dr Tough (Horseshoes, Griggs Green) claimed that the traffic impact assessment was inadequate & inaccurate as it ignored the BOAT which gives access to the Common, would form part of the round-the-village cycleway & had many vulnerable users. He was also concerned about the junction with Longmoor Rd & claimed that sight-lines were obscured by advertising signs.

Ms Oliva (11 Fairway Close) claimed that the site was outside the settlement boundary & adjacent to SINC & SSSI sites. She considered that the proposals were contrary to policy in relation to access, sustainability, transport, tourism & conservation, & she did not think that the infrastructure would be able to cope. She was also concerned about setting a precedent for other sites outside the development boundary, the lack of an environmental impact assessment & an earlier non-determined planning application, submitted in 2002, which included the provision of 300 car parking spaces.

Mr Bowden (2 Fairway Close) was concerned about additional traffic & the effect on local businesses, as he claimed that many local outlets providing accommodation only had around 60% occupancy.

The applicant responded to some of the issues raised: they had been working with English Nature to produce an environmental impact assessment; he was pleased that local people were enjoying the facilities provided, but claimed that it would not be financially viable to continue as they were running at a huge loss; they were only expecting a 60-65% occupancy; there would be no problem about widening the track or improving the junction with Longmoor Rd if required.

Mrs Leonard (14 Fairway Close) was concerned that there would be additional noisy functions to entertain the occupants of the cabins, which would affect both neighbours & wildlife.

Mrs Penny (Fairway Close) queried where the occupants would get their provisions for the self-catering cabins & considered that it was likely to be off-site, thereby generating additional traffic.

Mr Spratt (The Paddocks, Queens Rd) claimed that many maintenance & refuse vehicles serving the site currently use Queens Rd, & he was concerned that the volume of this traffic would increase considerably & that Queens Rd would be used as an alternative route to the site.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Croucher recommended that the Parish Council should object to the application as there was no environmental impact assessment, the traffic impact assessment was poor, there was no reference to improving the track, the development was too large with no proven need & there were no accessibility or transport provisions. There was also clearly conflict with the residents of Fairway Close & would be intrusive. Although the Copse was well tucked away & there would therefore be less impact on neighbours, it was too close to a SSSI area.

Cllr Coyte added that there was also the impact on the sewerage system & other services to be taken into consideration, which would be fairly major, particularly if both applications were granted.

Cllr Atherden claimed that the application did not conform to any planning requirement.

Decision:

Strongly object on the following grounds:

1. no environmental impact assessment;
2. traffic impact assessment very poor & not linked to other current application, F 21589/49/OUT/JH;
3. no improvements proposed to single-track road to site, which is a BOAT providing access to the Common;
4. over-development of site;
5. the two-storey dwellings, raised on stilts, are out-of-keeping with the surrounding area;
6. outside the settlement boundary where development in the countryside is not allowed;
7. detrimental to the amenities of nearby residents in terms of noise & nuisance;
8. the Copse site would have less impact on neighbours, but is too close to nature conservation areas;
9. not sustainable as no public transport;
10. undesirable impact on Hampshire County Council cycle-route users;
11. concerned that amount of traffic using Queens Road likely to increase, particularly refuse & maintenance vehicles;
12. inadequate junction with Longmoor Rd, with obscured sight-lines (signs & telegraph poles);
13. sewerage issue still needs to be addressed.

F 21589/49/OUT/JH Outline application - hotel extension, new conference centre & alterations to health club - Old Thorns Golf & Country Club, Weavers Down, Liphook London Kosaido

Cllr Croucher reported that this application had also generated a large amount of correspondence from parishioners.

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

Firstly, Mr Rowe (Hollydown House, Griggs Green) stated that his primary concern was the access road, which was single-track outside the Deers Hut & narrowed at the junction with Longmoor Rd, & he considered that permission should be conditional on the road being widened to give proper access.

Mr Leigh (6 Fairway Close) claimed that there was a constant stream of traffic along the single-track road to Old Thorns itself, which raised safety issues for walkers, riders & customers of the Deers Hut.

Ms Oliva (11 Fairway Close) considered that there was insufficient information submitted on the design & impact of the new development, such as trip generation & subsequent effect on local roads, & that the proposals were against government policy, with no supporting materials provided.

Dr Tough (Horseshoes, Griggs Green) pointed out that the application did not include a transport impact assessment.

Mr Privett (Brambles, Hazeldene Rd) was concerned about the effect on the sewerage system, which he claimed was currently over-loaded resulting in the system backing-up recently.

Mr Dockree (2 Longmoor Rd) claimed that the whole sewerage system needed to be upgraded before any further development was permitted & that Thames Water had been claiming that they would update the pumping station for some time now. He added that the problem was always caused by fat from Old Thorns bunging up the holding tanks in Bircholt Rd.

Mr Dormer (7 Fairway Close) stated that the Local Plan specified sites for hotel development & this was not one of them. The site was outside the development boundary & the application was contrary to policy TM3.

The applicant pointed out that the proposal did not involve the introduction of conference facilities, as was being implied, as such facilities had been conducted on-site for some time.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Croucher stated that all previous permissions had lapsed, although they did have some bearing on this application. He added that there was no environmental impact assessment, which was especially important as the site was in the countryside, & no traffic generation report or assessment of the junction with Longmoor Rd included, both of which had been given with previous submissions. There was also a continuous problem with sewerage in this area, & he considered that waste water & sewerage should be treated on-site. The track to the development was in the ownership of three free-holders & the middle section was very narrow. No reference was made as to how the accessibility issue should be addressed, which was necessary as there was no public transport to the site. For these reasons he concluded that the Parish Council should object to the application.

Cllr Atherden stated that an alternative to on-site sewerage treatment would be a large developer contribution.

Decision:

Object on the following grounds:

1. no environmental impact assessment;
2. no transport impact assessment;
3. no plans for improvements at junction with Longmoor Rd;
4. no proposed improvements to single-track access road where pedestrians, walkers, horse-riders & children are at risk as no pavement, particularly in the case of large events which would generate excess traffic;
5. current sewerage system not able to cope at present, nor has it for the past 20 years, therefore waste water & sewerage must be the (financial) responsibility of the applicant;

6. contrary to sustainability of enlarged conference centre as no public transport;
7. outside settlement boundary, contrary to policy TM3.

**F 23650/21/OUT/JR Outline application - retirement village comprising Helical
Cllr S Coyte 150 dwellings with associated access & parking (Liphook)
- King George's Hospital site, London Rd, Liphook Ltd**

Cllr Coyte reported that the buildings were a mix of two- & three-storey, & added that as it was a special site, landmark buildings were required. He explained that the gatehouse & the walled garden were to be restored & the latter used as a leisure area, there would be a community building with health & medical facilities plus a restaurant, & a new drive, parallel to the current one, would be constructed for use as a footpath & emergency access. He added that the land would be maintained by a management company.

Cllr Dawkins asked where the access to the site would be located. Cllr Coyte replied that it would be in Hewshott Lane, about 50 or 60m to the right of the current access.

Cllr Fitcher inquired whether the proposals included any affordable housing. Cllr Coyte replied that the plans stated that the requirement would be negotiated with the District Council. The Chairman added that this was an outline application & was therefore only concerned with the positioning & size of the buildings.

Cllr Croucher stated that he understood that the Inspector had concluded that the site should house a mixed development & he was concerned that this application did not comply with the requirement as it was drawn up before the draft Development Brief had been issued.

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

Firstly, Mr Easton (Stone Quarry House, Hewshott Lane) voiced his concerns about the likely increase in traffic using Hewshott Lane, particularly large vehicles, & thought that speed humps should be introduced at the top of the Lane.

Mrs Easton (Stone Quarry House, Hewshott Lane) was concerned about the effect of additional houses on the River Wey drainage system. Cllr Coyte reassured her that surface water drainage would be dealt with by means of a soakaway & main drainage would be used for sewerage.

Cllr Tough (Parish Transport Representative) requested a developer contribution towards making Liphook Station more accessible.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Atherden asked whether the transport impact assessment included trains & buses. Cllr Coyte confirmed that it did.

Cllr Walters stated that he was in favour of supporting the application in order to try & conserve the area as much as possible, & he pointed out that it could help to release larger houses in the area if local people were to move into the retirement village.

Cllr Croucher claimed that a mixed development could provide a better environment & stated that he did not support the concept of retirement villages.

Cllr Fitcher stated that he would support this application.

Cllr Dawkins pointed out that when the Parish Council first saw a similar application about two years ago, there were certain issues, such as medical facilities, which were not resolved. Cllr Coyte replied that the proposed medical facility in the retirement village would have a nurse, & that the applicant had contacted both doctor's surgeries in the village & both had felt that they could provide GP coverage.

Cllr Atherden stated that he visualised a "retirement ghetto" & considered that a mixed development, possibly with a higher than average proportion of retired people, would offer many social benefits.

Cllr Coyte reported that the documents included reference to the exhibition held in the Liphook Millennium Centre in September, when around 70% of the 135 respondents who returned a questionnaire were in favour of a retirement village rather than open market housing. He added that he considered the on-site parking provision to be inadequate.

The Chairman proposed a vote on whether to support the application. A vote was taken (4 in favour; 3 against). She also asked members to vote on which of the two applications they preferred, the retirement village or open market housing. A vote was taken (4 preferring the retirement village; 3 preferring open market housing).

Decision: Support this application as it facilitates the future landscape management of this extremely important site, & for this reason prefer this application to the open market housing alternative (F 23650/24;25/OUT/JR). However, have concerns re: the following issues & would like to see:

1. more car parking provision as site is in a rural area;
2. underground car parking to preserve the landscape;
3. footpath link to Parsley Cottage in Hewshott Lane;
4. introduction of a 'no right turn' into Hewshott Lane for traffic exiting the site;
5. traffic calming measures in Hewshott Lane;
6. developer contribution to disabled & elderly access at Liphook Station (southbound platform).

Please also refer to Parish Council comments re: draft development brief (submitted to EHDC on 29.11.2005).

**F 23650/24/OUT/JR Outline application - 150 market dwellings with Helical
/25/OUT/JR associated access & parking - King George's (Liphook)
Cllr S Coyte Hospital site, London Rd, Liphook Ltd**

Cllr Coyte stated that this application would be visually similar to the retirement village scheme. There would not be management of the site, but there would be more public open space, as the applicant would expect the District or Parish Council to take on the maintenance of the walled garden, play area & meadow land. It would have the same access road, on-site affordable housing & refuse collection areas.

Cllr Croucher was concerned about the liability of managing the open space.

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

Firstly, Mrs Easton (Stone Quarry House, Hewshott Lane) voiced her concerns about the safety of children playing in Hewshott Lane, particularly as it was so close to the A3. Cllr Coyte replied that it was a concern, but it was not however a planning consideration.

Ms Doubtfire (Chiltlee Manor Residents Association) talked about the difficulties of running a managed estate. She claimed that this application was a development without conservation, whereas the retirement village scheme with land management had to be a better proposal.

The meeting was then reconvened.

The Chairman asked members whether they supported this application in principle & proposed that a vote was held. A vote was taken (4 in favour; 3 against).

Decision: Support this application in principle, but wish to see:

1. some underground car parking in order to preserve the landscape;
2. some form of management to preserve the Open Space, the walled garden & the gatehouse;

3. low-level lighting;
4. affordable housing pepper-potted around the site;
5. footpath link to Parsley Cottage in Hewshott Lane;
6. introduction of a 'no right turn' into Hewshott Lane for traffic exiting the site;
7. traffic calming measures in Hewshott Lane;
8. developer contribution to disabled & elderly access at Liphook Station (southbound platform).

Please also refer to Parish Council comments re: draft development brief (submitted to EHDC on 29.11.2005).

F 23717/6/OUT/JP **Outline application - 14 dwellings, comprising three** **McCarthy &**
Cllr M Croucher **detached houses & one block of 11 flats, following** **Stone (Devs)**
 demolition of two dwellings - site of 51 London Rd **Ltd**
 & 15 Tower Rd, Liphook

Cllr Croucher reported that an earlier application for more than twice as many units on this site had been refused.

Cllr Futchter inquired whether the per unit on-site parking provision had increased. Cllr Croucher confirmed that it had.

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

Firstly, Mr Lovewell (21 Greenfield Close) claimed that this was a vast improvement on the previous application, although it still constituted gross over-development given that there were only two properties currently on the site. He was concerned about the height of the trees surrounding the property, which the application stated were 9m high. His house would back onto the higher flats & he was concerned that if the trees were reduced, he would face lack of privacy & light.

Cllr Tough (Parish Transport Representative) requested a developer contribution towards making Liphook Station more accessible.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Dawkins asked about the density, & Cllr Croucher replied that it was well below what it could be.

Cllr Croucher added that he was still concerned about the amount of on-site parking, which was marginally over one per living unit, & he considered that there should be more parking spaces, preferably underground. He stated that he could possibly support this application if more parking space were to be provided.

Cllr Coyte stated that this was a very outline application. He agreed that there was the potential for more than one car to be owned by the occupants of any one unit & commented that no information was given about garaging on the site. He felt that the applicant had not given sufficient attention to the parking issue.

Cllr Walters stated that he strongly objected to the application: he stated that the land sloped & the highest buildings would be on the highest point; the on-site parking provision was far too small; the site was situated on a busy junction which already had serious parking congestion problems; the proposal would involve the loss of trees & buildings were too close to other trees which would probably result in their removal in the future.

Cllr Atherden agreed with Cllr Walters' comments.

Cllr Coyte queried the need for the 2½-storey three-bedroom house.

Decision:

Object on the following grounds:

1. 2½-storey dwellings are out-of-keeping with adjacent properties;

Decision: No objections.

**F 34491/2/TPO/AMP Prune one beech & one eucalyptus - 83 Chiltley Mr Franklin
C Darter Way, Liphook**

Mrs Darter did not object to this application. The beech was an exceptionally large spreading tree at the end of the garden, overlooking the railway line & overhanging a neighbour's garden. Ideally, the branch overhanging the neighbour's garden should be cut off at the main trunk to make the tree more balanced. Branches hanging over the applicant's garden should be reduced to 2.5m from the ground & the height reduced by 20% to help prevent the tree from dropping onto the railway line & to reduce shade to the garden. The eucalyptus in the front garden was also very large & had become straggly, & the tree as a whole needed reshaping & crown-lifting. The large branch over the footpath could be removed at the base, & other hanging branches should be reduced to 5m over the drive & 2.5m over the grass & footpath.

Decision: No objections - recommend the following works:
Beech - the branch overhanging the neighbour's garden should be cut off at the main trunk to make the tree more balanced, & branches hanging over the applicant's garden should be reduced to 2.5m from the ground & the height reduced by 20%.
Eucalyptus - the tree as a whole needs reshaping & crown-lifting, the large branch over the footpath could be removed at the base, & other hanging branches should be reduced to 5m over the drive & 2.5m over the grass & footpath.

**F 38547/1/TPO/AMP Reduce four beech to 7m in height, crown thin Mr Jeffries
C Darter & prune - 57 Shepherds Way, Liphook**

Mrs Darter reported that this was a very unusual application, to which she had no objection. The trees, the remains of an old hedgerow, were in the garden of 57 Shepherds Way on the fence-line with the applicant's garden, Maple Cottage in Goldenfields. Permission had already been given to prune these trees in 2003, & the beech trunks were still about 7m in height with a few small branches protruding into the applicant's garden. Therefore no reduction in height was necessary & there were no crowns to thin, however the few small branches growing into the applicant's garden could be reduced.

Decision: No objections - following work conducted in 2003, no reduction in height is necessary & there are no crowns to thin, however the few small branches growing into the applicant's garden could be reduced.

7. ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS

There were none.

8. RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (See Appendix 1)

These were noted.

9. SITE VISIT

Land South of Broomsquires, Hammer Vale (F 22017/7/FUL/JN)

It was noted that an EHDC site visit was taking place at 9.20am on Friday 16 December 2005. It was agreed that Cllr Walters would represent the Parish Council, & that Cllr Futcher & Mrs Darter (Parish Tree Warden) would also attend.

10. PLANNING APPEALS

46 Chiltley Lane, Liphook (F 39060/3/FUL/JR)

It was noted that an appeal by Mrs Seaton (re: refusal of planning permission for a detached two-storey dwelling with garage) would be dealt with by Written Representations. Original Parish Council comments (see Appendix 2) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

Cypress, Hill House Hill, Liphook (F 39607/OUT/JN)

It was noted that an appeal by Mr Burrows (re: refusal of outline planning permission for a detached house) would be dealt with by Written Representations. Original Parish Council comments (see Appendix 2) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

11. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

E.H. 638 (13.5.2005) - 21 Newtown Rd, Liphook

It was noted that a provisional TPO on a yew tree in the south-west corner of the rear garden had been confirmed without modification.

12. THE SURREY WASTE PLAN - PREFERRED PLAN/STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT - PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Cllr Atherden reported that this was an excellent document & he had produced a response on behalf of the Parish Council. The Clerk confirmed that the response had been sent to Surrey CC on 9 December 2005.

13. WEST SUSSEX CC - MINERALS DEVELOPMENT PLAN: ISSUES & OPTIONS - PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Cllr Walters reported that this was a large comprehensive report, but that very little of it affected Bramshott & Liphook Parish. He proposed that the Parish Council should respond, accepting the recommendations of the report. This was agreed.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 11.00pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 16 January 2006.

Signed
Presiding Chairman

Original Parish Council comments (15.8.2005; 16.5.2005)

F 39060/3/FUL/JR Cllr F Dawkins <u>Decision:</u>	Detached two-storey dwelling with garage - 46 Chiltley Lane, Liphook Continue to strongly object on the following grounds: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. inappropriate sub-division of plot;2. over-development of site;3. inappropriate in this rural lane in a SINC;4. cumulative effect of this application & previous applications at 44 Chiltley Lane would constitute gross over-development;5. highway grounds - Chiltley Lane not suitable for additional traffic & also concerned about likely damage caused by construction vehicles;6. object to car parking adjacent to the roadside - parking should all be to the rear of the properties;7. could lead to further applications on this site & creeping urbanisation of this rural area, which is immediately adjacent to an H9 area (namely the Berg Estate).	Mrs Seaton
F 39607/OUT/JN Cllr M Croucher <u>Decision:</u>	Outline application - detached house - Cypress, Hill House Hill, Liphook No objections provided new house in-keeping with the character of adjacent properties in terms of size & design.	Mr Burrows