



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 OFFICES, MIDHURST ROAD, LIPHOOK ON
MONDAY 18 JULY 2005.**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs A James (Chairman), Cllr N Atherden, Cllr M Croucher, Cllr F Dawkins, Cllr W Ratcliffe & Cllr J Walters. Cllr B Hope, Cllr E Hope (EHDC), Mrs C Darter (Parish Tree Warden), one member of the press & 21 members of the public also attended.

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
were received from Cllr S Coyte & Cllr L Futcher.
- 2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 13 JUNE 2005**
These were confirmed & signed as being a true record of the meeting.
- 3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**
There were none.
- 4. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**
The Chairman announced the good news that all four of the OSU site appeals had been dismissed. She thanked all members of the public who had been involved & the Planning Committee, particularly Cllr Walters for speaking at EHDC's South Planning Committee meetings.

She also reported that the Inspector's recommendations on all Local Plan policies & EHDC's subsequent responses had been published, & this document was available for inspection in the Parish Office. She recommended that anyone interested in any specific sites should read the relevant parts as the changes would be going out for public consultation.

She then 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

APPLICANT

F 20202/3/FUL/JN Change of use of garage to cattery – Quince Cottage, Mr Darling
Cllr Mrs A James Burgh Hill Rd, Liphook

The Chairman explained that the site was located at the end of an unmade track & was one of three terraced houses. The track was not owned by the occupants, but they had a right of way over it. The applicant had claimed that they would restrict the times at which customers could visit & made suggestions as to where customers could park. The Chairman had received two letters of objection, one of them from the owner of the track.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Mr Gilmour (1 Old Mill Cottages) to submit a further letter of objection from another neighbour & to inquire whether it was a requirement to post notice of the application on the site. The Chairman replied that the only requirement was for notices to be published in the local paper. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Atherden considered that the Parish Council should object to the application as it constituted commercial use on a residential site in the countryside & would result in an increase in traffic.

Cllr Walters agreed that traffic & parking would create problems.

Decision:

Object on the following grounds:

1. as application is for change to business use, granting permission would also permit site to be used for other types of business;
2. site has dangerous access;
3. entrance is not in applicant's ownership, therefore cannot advertise it, which could result in additional traffic as drivers search for the entrance.

F 20653/2/FUL/SY Single-storey extension to side & pitched roof to Mr & Mrs
Cllr F Dawkins existing porch – Tanglewood, Midhurst Rd, Liphook Finch

Cllr Dawkins explained the location & confirmed that it was a straight-forward extension which, in his opinion, would improve the appearance of the house. He added that it could not be seen by anyone, not even from the adjacent railway line.

Decision: No objections providing matching materials used.

F 23270/11/FUL/JP Four detached dwellings, garaging & associated access Dix Belgravia Ltd
Cllr J Walters - 51 Tunbridge Crescent, Liphook

Cllr Walters explained that the Parish Council had seen many applications for this site, the last of which was for four houses instead of four chalet dwellings as allowed in the outline permission already granted. There were still problems with this application, including effect on trees, overlooking other properties & the designs of the houses. He considered that the height was acceptable but each had dormer windows at both the front & the rear, plus windows in the sides.

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

First Ms Mees (57 Tunbridge Crescent) queried why EHDC had accepted these plans as they were not significantly different from previous plans, & she had been advised by Planning Aid that legislation had been passed which prevented the submission of amended plans without any substantial changes. Her main objection was that the garage for plot 1 was sited so as to allow access to further development & she reported that many residents had been approached to sell land. She considered that the development would destroy Tunbridge Crescent as a family unit & cul-de-sac.

The Chairman responded that, although the earlier appeal against refusal for eleven houses had been dismissed, the Inspector had considered the access to be acceptable.

Mr Morgan (41 Tunbridge Crescent) claimed that these plans still included rumble-strips which would create a noise nuisance & would, in his opinion, serve no useful purpose. Although there was only one upper-storey window facing westwards in the house on plot 1, it would provide a prime view across other houses' gardens, especially if the conifers were felled as was likely given that they occupied such a large area of the site. The dormer windows would contravene one of the conditions of the existing outline permission as it stated that all upstairs accommodation should be contained in the roof space.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Walters concluded that the windows, especially the west-facing ones, would overlook properties in Tunbridge Crescent, & probably those in Hunters Chase. He considered that the dormers should be replaced with velux windows & the west-facing windows should either be removed or glazed with obscure glass.

Decision: Continue to object to this application:

1. layout not consistent with existing outline permission as plot 1 garage needs to revert to original position;
2. dwelling on plot 4 still too close to TPO'd trees;
3. object to the design of the houses with dormer windows on all four sides as these are not chalet bungalows as permitted;
4. designs are out-of-keeping with surrounding chalet bungalows;
5. object to the rumble-strip which will cause noise nuisance to adjacent neighbours;
6. object to west-facing first-floor window in house on plot 1 as would be detrimental to the amenities of the rear gardens of the adjacent bungalows.

F 23550/9/FUL/SM Cllr F Dawkins	Relief of Condition 8 F 23550/006 (gate set back 4.5m) - land east of Cornwall House, Passfield Common, Passfield	The Classic Home Company Ltd
--	--	-------------------------------------

Decision: No objections.

F 23717/4/FUL/JP Cllr M Croucher	35 sheltered apartments with communal facilities, car parking, associated access & landscaping (after demolition of two dwellings) – 51 London Rd & 15 Tower Rd, Liphook	McCarthy & Stone (Devs) Ltd
---	---	--

Cllr Croucher explained that the development was designed for elderly people (defined as those aged 55+!). The proposals involved the demolition of the two properties, & the conversion of the London Rd access to a pedestrian entrance with the Tower Rd entrance being retained for vehicular use. There would be no effective off-site parking & only eleven on-site spaces. He added that other similar developments in Liphook, namely Hanover Court (36 properties; 17 parking spaces; 19 car-owning residents) & Fletchers Field (52; 13; 21 respectively), have severe parking problems. At Hanover Court refuse collection was almost impossible & the shuttle bus often could not stop outside as there were too many cars blocking the road. He suggested that a possible solution would be underground parking.

He added that there was no affordable housing included on-site, the applicant was instead proposing just an off-site contribution as they claimed that mixed developments were not workable.

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

Firstly, Mrs Darter (Parish Tree Warden) reported that there were groups of TPO'd trees on the site, but she had not seen how the development would impact on them.

Mr Lovewell (21 Greenfield Close) explained that his house backed onto the site, with an exceptionally high hedge of leylandi trees between them. The current owner had agreed to reduce the height of this hedge, but had not done so. The new High Hedges legislation should help to enforce this, however if they do obtain their right to light they may well lose their privacy if this development goes ahead, as they would be overlooked by two & three-storey flats. He was also concerned about traffic/parking as he claimed that 55+ is not retirement age, & many people drive for much longer.

Mr James (9 Tower Rd) claimed that the junction of London Rd & Tower Rd was an appalling junction, even for good drivers.

Mr Telfer (26 Hanover Court) explained that Hanover Court was sheltered accommodation & as this proposed development was very close to the boundary, the new flats would look directly into Hanover Court bedrooms. Many of the residents were very elderly, sick & bedridden, & all valued their privacy & sunlight very much. He also queried where construction vehicles would park as there would not be room on-site, & added that it would be out-of-keeping as there were not any other three-storey buildings in the vicinity.

Mr Shelton (70 London Rd) claimed that his property would probably be most affected as he lived in the bungalow directly opposite the site. He was concerned about speeding on London Rd, the lack of light caused by the leylandi hedge & objected to the three-storey building.

Mr Lovewell added that the plans show the leylandi hedge being retained at its current height.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Croucher pointed out that the development would not actually overlook Hanover Court as the only window on that side appeared to be in a stairwell, but that Hanover Court would face a huge solid slab. The relative height of the development was most important, & officers should check this carefully, as the plans could be quite deceptive in this respect.

Cllr Walters claimed that the applicant's document was obviously a standard one, which had not been prepared with Liphook in mind, as it repeatedly referred to Liphook as a town & included phrases such as "well placed for travel to city centre". It majored on the availability of public transport, which does not actually exist, for example residents have to drive to all the hospitals which serve the area.

Cllr Atherden claimed that the applicant was not being realistic if they expected people of 55+ to give up their cars if they moved into sheltered housing.

- Decision:** Strongly object on the following grounds:
1. gross over-development of the site;
 2. inadequate car parking facilities, both on & off-site;
 3. no affordable housing;
 4. retention of tree hedge-line would not now be legal;
 5. three-storey building out-of-keeping;
 6. height of buildings would be detrimental to amenities of Greenfield Close & London Rd (especially No 70);
 7. three-storey flank wall facing Hanover Court would be visibly objectionable;
 8. insufficient space on-site for construction vehicles;
 9. concerns about TPO'd trees;
 10. object on highway grounds as access too close to the difficult junction of Tower Rd & London Rd;
 11. likely to result in significant parking problems (other sheltered developments in Liphook with similar ratios of residents to car parking spaces, namely Hanover Court & Fletchers Field, both experience considerable parking problems);
 12. the public transport, referred to in the application, is exceptionally limited.

F 29238/11/FUL/JN Cllr M Croucher	Extension to form corridor & internal alterations - Churchers College Junior School, Midhurst Rd, Liphook	Governors of Churchers College
--	--	---------------------------------------

Decision: No objections.

F 31127/1/FUL/SY Cllr W Ratcliffe	First-floor rear extension – Passfield Corner, Passfield Rd, Passfield	Dr & Mrs Hardwick
--	---	------------------------------

Decision: No objections provided work is sympathetic to this historic house.

F 33697/5/FUL/JN Cllr M Croucher	Single-storey extension to side – 2 Reedens Bungalows, Rectory Lane, Bramshott	Mr & Mrs Bassom
---	---	----------------------------

Decision: No objections.

F 36898/2/FUL/JR Cllr M Croucher	Change of use of land to form car park & boundary fence following demolition of wall – 28 Longmoor Rd, Liphook	Mr Johnson
---	---	-------------------

Decision: No objections.

F 37051/3/FUL/SY	Retention of side extension – 118 Haslemere Rd,	Mr Tancock
-------------------------	--	-------------------

Cllr Atherden could not see any reason to object to this application & reported that the immediate neighbour at 9 Ash Grove did not object, but had concerns about the retention of the mossbank between the two properties & possible exasperation of the existing rainwater run-off problems, where water from the site runs across the garden of 9 Ash Grove following heavy rain. He also added that the extension would make No 10 much larger than any other property in Ash Grove, although this was not particularly a problem.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Mr Ball (9 Ash Grove) to comment on the application. He confirmed that he did not object to it, but would like the mossbank protected & steps taken to ensure that soakaways were adequate. The meeting was then reconvened.

Decision: No objections provided that:
1. mossbank between 9 & 10 Ash Grove is protected during construction & retained thereafter;
2. additional rainwater run-off to be properly attended to, in order to prevent flooding to 9 Ash Grove.

F 39891/FUL/SY **Single-storey rear extension – 14 Fairway Close,** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr W Ratcliffe **Liphook** **Selley**
Decision: No objections.

F39900/FUL/SY **Detached double garage to front – Gunns,** **Brigadier &**
Cllr N Atherden **1 Hollycombe Close, Liphook** **Mrs Green**
Decision: No objections provided permitted development rights for the garage roofspace are removed.

TREE APPLICATION

F 35497/5/TPO/AMP **Prune tree – 41 Shepherds Way, Liphook** **Mr Kippax**
Mrs C Darter

Mrs Darter reported that she had no objections to this application. The tree was actually two large oaks about 2m apart, which were taller than the house with branches overhanging the roof. She did not consider that crown-lifting was the answer as all the branches were already high up the trunk, & she suggested a 25-30% shortening of the branches overhanging the house & some shortening of those overhanging the road. She added that it would be acceptable if the applicant only wanted to prune the oak nearest to the house.

Decision: No objection to a 25-30% shortening of branches overhanging the house & some shortening of those overhanging the road – do not consider that crown-lifting is the answer as all the branches are already high up the trunk.

7. ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS

F 25169/9/RES/SM **Dwelling with garage (reserved matters relating to** **Mr Pettett**

Cllr J Walters **F 25169/008) – land adjoining The Pine Bungalow,
Longmoor Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Walters explained that outline permission had been granted, with many conditions on drainage & sewerage matters, which the Parish Council would not be able to comment on. The neighbours were not concerned about it, as it was hidden by many trees & hedges. The height, 8m, was in-keeping with many of the surrounding houses.

Decision: No objections.

TREE APPLICATION

F 39978/TPO/AMP **Fell three conifer trees – 8 Goldenfields Close,** **Mr Hurlstone**
Mrs C Darter **Liphook**

Mrs Darter had no objections to the felling of these trees which were all Thuyas (cypress look-alikes). Two were about 2.5m from the house, about 30 years old & may not even be in the 1972 TPO. The third was much older &, although in the same row, was about 4m away from the house. All three were very healthy, but very tall & threw too much shade over the house. The trees might be a safety threat as they were so close to the building & the fence. She added that the house should not have been built so close to the trees.

Councillor Croucher asked whether they could be successfully pruned & Mrs Darter confirmed that they could not.

The Chairman pointed out that the trees were there when the house was built about two years ago. Mrs Darter said that she had not been aware of the application at the time, but had she been aware she would have objected.

The Chairman considered that if the trees were TPO'd the Parish Council should object to the proposed felling.

Decision: Object to the felling of these Thuya trees if they are TPO'd
(possible that the younger two, closest to the house, are not
included in the 1972 TPO).

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

9. PLANNING APPEALS

Land to north of 49-57 Tunbridge Crescent, Liphook (F 23270/10/FUL/JP)

It was noted that appeal by Dix Belgravia Ltd (re: refusal of planning permission for four detached dwellings with associated access, garages & landscaping) would be dealt with by Written Representations. Parish Council comments (see Appendix 2) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

Haylands, Burgh Hill Rd, Bramshott (F.29095/3/OUT/JR)

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

Former OSU site, Midhurst Rd, Liphook (F 33993/45;46;47;49/FUL/JH)

It was noted that appeals by Tifftop Ltd (re: refusal/non-determination of planning applications for industrial units, commercial space, live/work units, office block & residential units) had been dismissed.

North of 94 - 102 Longmoor Rd, Liphook (F 37866/OUT/NP)

It was noted that appeal by Strathmoor Developments Ltd & Codex Holdings Ltd (re: refusal of outline planning permission for 19 dwellings to replace two dwellings) had been withdrawn.

6 The Square, Liphook (F 38595/2/FUL/JP)

It was noted that appeal by Mr & Mrs Blower (re: refusal of planning permission for two semi-detached dwellings to the rear & new external access stairs to existing) would be dealt with by Written Representations. Original Parish Council comments (see Appendix 2) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

10. TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

E.H. 608 (29.11.2004) – land to rear of 7-11 Tunbridge Crescent, Liphook

It was noted that provisional TPO on a group of six limes & a sycamore on land to the rear of 7-11 Tunbridge Crescent & to the east of The Presbytery, Headley Rd had been confirmed without modification.

E.H. 624 (22.2.2005) – Elmhurst, Passfield Common, Passfield

It was noted that provisional TPO on Chile pine in front garden to the south west of the main house had been confirmed without modification.

11. MINERALS & WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The Chairman reported that this consultation was not about Minerals & Waste policy, but about how they consult with the public, similar to the consultation conducted by Chichester DC which was discussed at the last meeting.

She reported that all the suggestions were good & proposed that the Parish Council made a favourable response, & also suggested local radio as a media for contacting housebound people.

Cllr Dawkins suggested local community websites & the Chairman confirmed that these were already included.

Cllr Walters thanked the Chairman for her work on this consultation.

It was agreed that a favourable response & local radio suggestion be submitted to Hants CC.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10.05pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on Monday 15 August 2005.

Signed
Presiding Chairman

Original Parish Council comments (20.9.2004; 14.3.2005; 22.11.2004)

- | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|
| F 23270/10/FUL/JP
Cllr L Futcher | Four detached dwellings with associated access, garages & landscaping - north 49-57 Tunbridge Crescent, Liphook | Dix Belgravia Ltd |
| <u>Decision:</u> | Object on the following grounds:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. style of houses unsuitable - should be chalet bungalows; 2. house/garage on plot 4 are too close to the tree; 3. garage on plot 1 should be returned to the position shown on the outline application; 4. lack of proper raised pedestrian footpath along single-width access road; 5. lack of area for bin storage by gates; 6. gated access not in-keeping with the area. | |
| F 29095/3/OUT/JR
Cllr Mrs A James | Outline application - replacement dwelling - Haylands, Burgh Hill Rd, Bramshott | Mr Shotton |
| <u>Decision:</u> | No objection to a replacement dwelling provided that:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it is no higher than existing property; 2. there are no windows in roof on roadside, as would overlook Field View & Knights Cottages; 3. it does not increase footprint by more than 50% of original building. | |
| F 38595/2/FUL/JP
Cllr R Kingshott | Two semi-detached dwellings to rear & new external access stairs to existing - 6 The Square, Liphook | Mr & Mrs Blower |
| <u>Decision:</u> | Strongly object on the following grounds:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. over-development of site; 2. design, height, mass & bulk of proposed building inappropriate in Conservation Area/adjacent to Listed Building; 3. object to external staircase (secure by design) in Conservation Area/adjacent to Listed Building; 4. detrimental to the amenities of Tap House, a Listed Building; 5. object to removal of tree, as provides visual amenity between the site & Liphook Garage; 6. object on highway grounds as blind access across busy pavement; 7. no means for contractors' vehicles to access the site. | |