



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 PARISH COUNCIL OFFICE, MIDHURST ROAD, LIPHOOK ON
MONDAY 27 FEBRUARY 2006**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs A James (Chairman), Cllr N Atherden, Cllr M Croucher, Cllr L Futcher, Cllr W Ratcliffe & Cllr J Walters. Cllr S James (EHDC/Hants CC), Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer), one member of the press & 14 members of the public also attended.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

were received from Cllr S Coyte.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 JANUARY 2006

These were confirmed & signed as being a true record of the meeting, subject to the following amendments:

- Decision for application F.49187/FUL/JN (on page 4) should read '*No objections in principle to the extension, but would like to ensure that the downstairs window on the NE elevation would not be'*;
- Conclusions (on page 5) should read 'Confirmed at the meeting held on 27 February 2006.'

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were none.

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. Four declarations were 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;
- The Chairman also declared personal, non-prejudicial interests in two applications, namely for Bishops Field in Bramshott Chase Rd (as she was known to the neighbours at Pickwick House) & Wakehurst in Limes Close (as it was very close to her house & she knew the owner);
- Cllr Croucher declared a personal interest in the application for 42 The Maltings as he knew the applicant.

6. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

APPLICANT

**F 20594/6/FUL/JN Two car parking spaces - land east of access road to Hanover Housing
Cllr M Croucher Hanover Court, Tower Rd, Liphook Association**

Cllr Croucher advised that the proposed parking spaces were on the corner by the entrance to Hanover Court, which was actually Highway land under a Highway tree. He claimed that the area was already very congested & he considered that the applicant should look to provide on-site parking. He recommended that the Parish Council should not support the application.

Decision: Object as would encourage vehicles to park on sight-lines - consideration should be given to finding more suitable on-site parking.

**F 20803/6/FUL/SY Conversion of garage into habitable accommodation Mr Tye
Cllr F Dawkins - The Freckling, Rectory Lane, Bramshott**

Cllr Dawkins explained the location of the site & advised that there had been a previous extension to the house. The current layout was a double-garage adjacent to the house, with a further single-garage adjacent to the double-garage. The proposal was to convert the single-garage into living accommodation. He did not consider that it would affect anyone as it was in the countryside & fairly well screened.

Cllr Croucher was concerned that it could set a precedent of building in the countryside as the previous extension was fairly extensive.

Decision: No objections provided occupied by a member of the same household as living in the main house.

**F 22115/22/FUL/JR Renewal of temporary permission (storage of Landclean
Cllr L Futcher construction plant & equipment, including Limited
containers) - land at Beaver Industrial Estate,
Midhurst Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Futchter explained that the site was currently used for storage & that the permission had already been extended several times. He had spoken to neighbours in Quebec Close who did not have any concerns about the site, other than it being an eyesore. However, he had been advised by the Parish Office staff that Chiltley Way residents, on the other side of the railway line, had been complaining about being disturbed by the noise of on-site vehicle movement early in the morning.

Cllr Dawkins, who used to live in Chiltley Way, confirmed that, due to the slope of the land, the site was very visible from there & he had occasionally heard vehicles moving around the site as early as 6am, including reverse-warning beepers which he claimed were very intrusive.

Decision: No objection to the extension of the temporary permission, but request that a time limit is imposed to restrict on-site vehicle movement to 7am - 7pm Monday - Friday & 7am - 1pm on Saturdays (i.e. no activity on Sundays or Bank Holidays).

**F 29675/2/FUL/SY Extension to side & detached replacement garage Mr & Mrs
Cllr Mrs A James /store - Willow Spring, Hewshott Lane, Liphook Greenwood**

The Chairman explained the location of the site & that there had been a previous two-storey extension. The proposal was for a modest extension to a small bungalow, comprising a single-storey extension at one end & a small infill to the previous extension at the rear. It would not affect any neighbours or trees. She offered to adjourn the meeting, but the applicant did not have anything further to add.

Decision: No objections.

**F 33340/1/FUL/SY Rear conservatory - 6 Erles Rd, Liphook Mrs Bias
Cllr J Walters**

Cllr Walters claimed that this was a standard conservatory to which none of the neighbours had raised any objections.

Decision: No objections.

**F 34664/1/FUL/JN First-floor extension to side - 42 The Maltings, Mr & Mrs
Cllr W Ratcliffe Liphook Pope**

Cllr Ratcliffe stated that the proposal would make little visual impact on the surroundings & none of the neighbours objected. He considered that it would make good use of the space available.

Decision: No objections provided matching materials used.

**F 33887/4/FUL/DM Installation of extractor flue to rear - 6 Midhurst Rd, Mr Cooper
Cllr N Atherden Liphook**

Cllr Atherden explained that the application was in respect of an installation to the rear of the ground-floor of 4-6 Midhurst Rd, which was occupied by Bibi Ana's Restaurant. The first-floor, 6A Midhurst Rd, was under separate ownership & used as a dwelling.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Ms Allen (6A Midhurst Rd) to comment on the application. She explained that the building was over 100 years old & she had lived there for the past 23 years. The current flue was within 2ft of her bedroom window, & the resultant smell & noise rendered the room unusable. She did not think that permission had ever been obtained for the flue. It was clearly an environmental issue & the applicant was proposing to re-route the flue, but she did not consider that this would solve the problems & indeed could even worsen the situation. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Atherden was concerned about the visual impact in the Conservation Area & recommended that the Parish Council should object to the application.

Decision: Object on the following grounds:

1. unacceptable visual impact in the Conservation Area;
2. noise & smell nuisance for occupants of above flat, 6A Midhurst Rd.

**F 40126/1/OUT/JR Outline application - two semi-detached dwellings Ms Bromley
Cllr J Walters & one bungalow - 3 Erles Rd, Liphook & Mr Mason**

Cllr Walters explained that the site had a planning history of many applications & two dismissed appeals. The Parish Council had considered & strongly objected to a similar application last November. He considered that the Parish Council should continue to object as most of their previous objections still applied, particularly the main objection of over- development. The agenda for the forthcoming South Planning Committee meeting showed that the EHDC Planning Officers were recommending approval & that the application had been designated as a Section 2 item, which meant that the Parish Council & the public would not get the opportunity to speak at the meeting. He was particularly concerned that EHDC's Highways Engineer had not raised any objections to the access, which was exceptionally close to a corner. Other concerns included the overlooking of the garden of 1 Erles Rd, the loss of amenity trees & the destruction of a Highway verge. He claimed that the Inspector's recommendations implied that a maximum of two dwellings should be housed on the site & suggested that the Parish Council recommend refusal.

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

Firstly, Mr Neaves (1 Erles Rd) claimed that his property would be most affected by the proposed development as the rear windows would look into his kitchen & the boundaries were very close to his house. He had issues with the designs & considered that the plans were misleading. He was also concerned about there being too many houses on the plot, which as a result would have very small gardens, & that the access to one of the dwellings was straight onto the public footpath. He added that the bungalow appeared to have a loft conversion which, by law, would be required to have a rear access from the roof, which would also overlook his property.

Mrs Slyfield (12 Erles Rd) was particularly concerned that the loss of trees would mean that they would be left facing a blank wall.

Mr Bell (16 Erles Rd) stated that the dwellings would be out-of-character with the surrounding properties &, although provision for parking had been made, he did not consider that it would be utilised. He added that he considered the proposed development to be a money-grabbing venture & claimed that the bungalow would be too small if it were to fit into the space available.

Mr Ward (9 Erles Rd) claimed that this application was very similar to previous ones which had been dismissed at appeal. He considered that the plot should only accommodate one dwelling as the only house, 7 Erles Rd, to be built on the original site was a bungalow which occupied a plot of similar size to this plot. His other concerns included that the development would be out-of-character as it involved two-storey dwellings & dwellings immediately adjacent to the public highway, & it would create severe parking & highway safety problems.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Decision:

Continue to strongly object on the following grounds:

1. over-development of very small plot;
2. new access for property on plot 2 too close to corner;
3. unacceptable form of infilling;
4. out-of-scale & form with surrounding dwellings;
5. in front of existing building line (contrary to restrictive covenant placed on all existing properties in Erles Rd);
6. detrimental to the amenities of 1 Erles Rd, & to the amenities of the proposed bungalow on plot 3;
7. displacement of on-street parking;
8. access to on-site parking places adjacent to 90° bend;

9. vehicles could not enter & leave the site in forward gear;
10. object to the loss of amenity trees;
11. the gardens (yards) of the proposed dwellings would be inadequate;
12. object to the porches of the dwellings on plots 2 & 3 opening directly onto the public footpath.

Additionally, would like to draw attention to the following statement, which the Inspector made when dismissing an appeal for a similar application (F.20730/3;4) in 1986: “... *any new development should relate sympathetically to the scale & form of the other dwellings in this attractive little backwater & particularly to adjacent dwellings.*” The Parish Council consider that the proposed development would not do so, & that it would in fact change the character of the area.

**F 49305/FUL/TW Two-storey rear extension - Clock House, Bramshott Mr & Mrs
Cllr Mrs A James Chase Rd, Liphook Kaloudis**

The Chairman explained the location of the site, & that it was immediately adjacent to a pair of cottages & was visible from the road, although partially shielded by greenery. The proposal involved a two-storey rear extension, & alterations involving the conversion of a garage & the space above it into a store & living accommodation respectively. The alterations involved changing the garage roof, which was previously hipped, into a gable-end with a large window. The neighbours at Greenways did not object to the rear extension, but were most concerned about the gable-end as it would be very close to their property.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Mr Horn (Greenways, Bramshott Chase Rd) to comment. He was concerned that there would only be 6m between his property & the new gable-end which would face his dining room & bedroom windows. He claimed that he would lose light, lose the view of the sky & that it would be detrimental to his amenities. The meeting was then reconvened.

Decision: No objection to the two-storey extension, but object to the removal of the hipped roof above the garage as would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjacent property, Greenways.

7. ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS

**F 26755/4/FUL/DM Six-stable block following demolition of existing Mr & Mrs
Cllr M Croucher three-stable block & repositioning of gate - Mellstrom
Colesfield, Woolmer Lane, Bramshott**

Cllr Croucher explained that Colesfield was part of the Woolmer Farm Estate & had no nearby neighbours. He thought that the only proviso should be that it should be for use by Colesfield inhabitants only & there should be no commercial or livery use.

Decision: No objections provided for personal use of occupants of Colesfield only & at no time to be sold off separately or changed to commercial use or livery.

**F 27296/17/FUL/SY Retention of conservatory to south elevation Mr Bryant
Cllr N Atherden - 9 Malthouse Court, Haslemere Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Atherden stated that this was a retrospective application for a property within the curtilage of Malthouse Farm House, which was a Listed Building. Prior to purchasing the property, the applicant had asked EHDC whether permission was needed for the conservatory & was told that it could be constructed within permitted development rights unless the property lay within the curtilage of a Listed Building. The applicant did not realise that it did as there was no mention of Listed Building curtilage in the Deeds, & therefore constructed the conservatory without obtaining permission. Several other properties within the curtilage of Malthouse Farm House also have similar conservatories, presumably also erected without permission. Cllr Atherden considered this to be a small, well balanced conservatory.

Decision: No objection to the retention of the conservatory.

The Chairman asked members to appoint a Chairman for the next two applications, & then left the meeting. Cllr Fatcher proposed Cllr Croucher, & this was seconded by Cllr Dawkins. Cllr Croucher took the Chair.

F 40069/FUL/TW Cllr F Dawkins	Ground-floor extension to rear, pitched roof over integral garage & utility, formation of entrance at side with porch, pitched roof over existing dormer window on first-floor, dormer window & balcony to rear - Bishops Field, Bramshott Chase Rd, Liphook	Mr & Mrs Wilms
---	---	---------------------------

Cllr Dawkins explained that this was a fairly old bungalow-type building in some disrepair. It was mostly single-storey, although it was higher in the centre with a hipped roof with a dormer. The proposed work was basically renovation which would be a great improvement provided matching materials were used.

Decision: No objections provided matching materials used.

F 49357/FUL/SY Mrs Cllr W Ratcliffe	Two-storey extension to side - Wakehurst, Limes Close, Bramshott Bolsover	Mr &
--	--	-----------------

Cllr Ratcliffe claimed that the house was only visible from two other properties in the Close, & neither of the owners had any objections. It would be a fairly substantial extension which would stick out further than the original part of the house, but he could not see any reason to refuse it. There was currently a pergola-type structure covered in greenery in the same position. It would be visible from Woolmer Lane, but there were not any houses in that part of the Lane.

Decision: No objections provided matching materials used.

Cllr Mrs James rejoined the meeting & resumed the Chair.

8. RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (See Appendix 1)
These were noted.

9. PLANNING APPEAL

16 Meadow Way, Liphook (F 39788/FUL/SY)

It was noted that appeal by Mr Read (re: refusal of planning permission for two-storey extension to side & pitched roof over single-storey extension to rear) would be dealt with by Written Representations. Original Parish Council comments (“*No objections to the proposed extension provided the narrow gap between the extension & the adjacent property (17 Meadow Way) meets Building Regulation requirements, or the extension is abutted to the neighbouring property.*”) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

10. EAST HAMPHIRE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

It was agreed that members should each complete Q.3 onwards of the “Getting You Involved” questionnaire (see Appendix 2) & pass their responses to the Information Officer by 6 March, who would compile the answers for approval at the next meeting on 20 March 2006, prior to submission to EHDC (by 7 April 2006).

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 9.40pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 20 March 2006.

Signed
Presiding Chairman

APPENDIX 2