



# BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK PARISH COUNCIL

Mr A S R GROVES  
CLERK

Tel: 01428 722988  
Fax: 01428 727335  
E-mail: [blpc1@tiscali.co.uk](mailto:blpc1@tiscali.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 16 JULY 2007.**

## MINUTES

### PRESENT WERE:

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

### 59/07 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

### 60/07 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2007

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

### 61/07 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were none.

### 62/07 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed two new co-opted parish councillors, Mrs Barbara Easton & Mr Philip Jordan, to the meeting. She explained that they were not members of the Planning Committee, but were interested in joining.

She explained that Mr Les Mann, the MD of Track Maintenance Equipment Ltd, was going to explain his proposals for the development of Unit 2 in Station Rd before the planning applications were considered. This would provide an opportunity for members to ask any questions about the proposals.

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.

63/07

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman read out the Declaration & asked whether members had any interests to declare. 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.

64/07

**OUTLINE PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE OF USE - UNIT 2, STATION RD, INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, LIPHOOK**

Mr Mann (MD, Track Maintenance Equipment Ltd) explained the proposals to house Track Maintenance Equipment (TME) Ltd & Haslemere Motorcycles Ltd (HML) on the site. The current owner of HML was retiring & the owner of TME was taking over the business, & was looking for a site to house the two businesses, both of which were currently based in Haslemere. This site in Liphook was selected as it was a suitable size/type of premise & in a location well placed to serve both customers & staff. TME was a small railway goods supply business, with two employees, which would have little, if any, tangible effect on the environment, operating between 08.30 & 17.30 Monday to Friday with around two or three deliveries/collections per week. HML currently employed 12 staff & would hope to create eight further jobs for local people. He emphasised that there was no intention to alter the structure of the building & added that the planning application had now been submitted to EHDC.

Cllr Croucher asked what the building was currently used for. Mr Mann replied that that it used to be a paper warehouse, but had been empty for the past seven years. They were hoping to obtain a change of use from warehouse (B8) to retail (A1).

The Chairman asked what was planned for the current HML site. Mr Mann replied that it had been sold.

Cllr Newman pointed out that, by not changing the structure, it would be possible to return the building to warehouse use. Mr Mann explained that the only likely change would be to relocate the access from the rear to the front of the building.

Cllr Carne commented on the likely effect of 30 motorcycles visiting the site each day. Mr Mann claimed that it would be less damaging than several large HGV lorries.

Cllr Mrs Easton asked about the availability of on-site parking. Mr Mann replied that there was more than ample space.

The Chairman thanked Mr Mann.

65/07

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**APPLICANT**

65/07.1

**F 21860/10/FUL/JM  
Cllr Mrs A James**

**Nine dwellings with associated access & garaging,  
following demolition of 20 Longmoor Rd (revised  
scheme) - 18a - 22 Longmoor Rd, Liphook**

**Peak Quality  
Homes**

The Chairman explained that the previous application, to which the Parish Council had objected (for reasons outlined in Appendix 2) was going to appeal. The previous application was for 13 dwellings, whereas this was for nine. However the footprint was almost the same as this application included six four-bedroom houses compared to the earlier one which was mostly two or three-bedroom houses.

In addition this application included some three-storey houses, whereas the earlier one was all two-storey houses. The application stated that they were planning to remove many of the trees in the tree screen between the site & The Grove. She concluded that it was no different to the earlier application, as the footprint was the same, & as the mass & bulk were greater the Parish Council's previous comments, with minor additions, were still relevant.

**Decision:**

Continue to object on the following grounds:

1. still strongly object to any extra vehicular movement opposite the entrance to Bohunt School (a secondary school with 1,200 pupils) for safety reasons;
2. grave concerns re: viability of proposed drainage as site & all surrounding properties are often waterlogged, in particular concerned about the possible effect on properties to the west along Longmoor Rd;
3. the Longmoor Rd drainage system is inadequate for the existing houses; further houses could only worsen the situation (see drainage conditions imposed as part of permission for development of the site of 94 & r/o 98-102 Longmoor Rd (F.37866/003/OUT));
4. over-development of the site;
5. strongly object to three-storey buildings;
6. mass, size & bulk remains the same as in the previous application;
7. backland development which would be out-of-keeping with the surrounding area & would set a precedent;
8. concerned about inaccuracies in Design & Access Statement - incorrect as there is no available access to The Grove, which is a private road;
9. would wish to see a landscape management plan to protect wildlife in the open space area;
10. concerned that the Landscape Statement suggests that the trees marked as red dots on the Landscape Plan would be felled.

**65/07.2**

**F 22095/13/FUL/AE  
Cllr N Newman**

**Three detached dwellings with access & parking,  
following demolition of dwelling - 6 Headley Rd,  
Liphook**

**Anwick Homes  
Ltd**

Cllr Newman reported that an earlier application had been withdrawn, & since that time the applicant had acquired additional land to provide seven parking spaces, which had been achieved without the loss of spaces at the adjacent Working Men's Club. The present house was suffering severe subsidence & it would not be viable to repair it. The proposed houses were quite attractive & would blend in well. The majority of the neighbours thought that two houses would be more appropriate than three, as the area gets very congested. There was also a great deal of concern about where construction lorries & visitors would park. He added that the hedge at the rear was being replaced with a brick wall.

**Decision:**

No objection provided that trees are planted around the perimeter of the site, especially at the rear to lessen the impact of the brick wall.

F 23717/9/FUL/JM  
Cllr M Croucher

**Application + pre-decision amendment (29.6.2007)**  
**- 27 sheltered apartments with communal facilities,**  
**car parking, associated access & landscaping**  
**- site of 51 London Rd & 15 Tower Rd, Liphook**

**McCarty & Stone**  
**(Developments)**  
**Ltd**

Cllr Croucher reported that this was one of a number of applications for this site, & was another variation of the same theme. It included a last minute amendment which involved the building being lowered 1m into the ground. This was being done as the building was very large & would therefore form a dominant feature. The Parish Council's main concern had always been the size & bulk of the building. The site was screened by trees, but there was no guarantee that they would stay as they were not the type which would be TPO'd.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Mr Walters (20 Tower Rd, Liphook) to comment on the application. He stated that the previous application had been unanimously rejected by EHDC. The design was a slight improvement on the previous application, but otherwise his objections were as before. It was still a massive building & had been rejected at the Public Inquiry for this reason. The site was unsustainable, despite the applicant claiming it was well served by public transport. The only buses were the National Express, the shuttlebus & three buses a day to Alton. The applicant claimed that local stores would deliver to the site, but there was nowhere for the delivery vans to park. The trees on the London Rd site were shown on the plans, but if they were removed it would open up the site & the building would be in full view. The resident's garden was smaller than that of the average house in Tower Rd & was completely in the shade. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Croucher considered that the comments made about the last application were still relevant & recommended that the same comments, with minor additions, should be submitted.

**Decision:**

Continue to strongly object on the following grounds:

1. gross over-development;
2. object to the mass, height & bulk of the three-storey buildings, which are inappropriate on this prominent site, especially now that the two buildings are joined together;
3. on-site parking provision is totally inadequate for residents of 27 flats plus visitors, staff, visiting staff & delivery vans (suggest underground parking could help to overcome this issue);
4. site unsustainable as not served by adequate public transport, especially buses;
5. insufficient recreational gardens;
6. design is still verging on institutional & does not contribute to the street-scene;
7. density is too high;
8. object to lack of traffic management at junction of London Rd & Tower Rd, especially as permission has recently been granted for eight flats on the site opposite;
9. not possible to have a legal guarantee to retain the high screening hedge.

#### 65/07.4

**F 23739/10/FUL/SY**      **Orangery/conservatory, following demolition of**      **Mr & Mrs**  
**Cllr J Carne**      **existing glazed conservatory - Upperfold, Hewshott**      **Bowring**  
   **Lane, Liphook**

Cllr Carne explained that the house was in a very large garden, which was completely screened by hedges. The proposed orangery was larger & more substantial than the current conservatory, but would fit in very well with the house.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

#### 65/07.5

**F 24342/2/ADV/PF**      **Retention of display of directional sign - land at**      **Passfield Business**  
**Cllr Mrs A James**      **junction of Hollywater Rd/B3004, Passfield**      **Centre Ltd**

The Chairman explained that the sign was opposite Passfield Post Office on National Trust land. It was green & did not look out of place nor interfere with sight-lines.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

#### 65/07.6

**F 26444/13/FUL/GC**      **Detached shed/store to rear - Mallards, Rectory Lane,**      **Mr Bird**  
**Cllr J Carne**      **Bramshott**

Cllr Carne reported that the shed was required to house agricultural machinery. The plot was well screened, the shed would match an existing shed & would be constructed from materials to match the house & shed.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

#### 65/07.7

**F 27625/24/FUL/LW**      **Use of site for gypsy-travellers (removal of conditions 1**      **Mr Black**  
**Cllr M Croucher**      **& 2 of F.27625/019) & replace with different condition**  
   **- Tree Tops, Hill House Hill, Liphook**

Cllr Croucher explained the location of the site & stated that it had originally been a nursery. The site had a long & complicated history, & there had been misuse of the site. He recommended objecting to the application as he did not consider that a gypsy-site, albeit a relatively small one, would be desirable or controllable. He pointed out that EHDC were in the process of setting up alternative sites for travellers.

The Chairman added that the current permission had been allowed on appeal when the Inspector had imposed the conditions that this application was seeking to remove. There had been a similar application two years ago, to which the Parish Council had objected as they wanted to retain the non-permanent residential status of the site & support the Inspector's recommendations. She proposed that the Parish Council should object again for these reasons.

**Decision:**                      Object as the Parish Council wants to retain the non-permanent residential status of the site & support the Planning Inspector's decision/conditions.



65/07.12

**F 37729/2/FUL/AE**      **3m high palisade security fencing - Countrywide Retail**      **Countrywide**  
**Cllr M Croucher**      **Store, 38 - 44 Station Rd, Liphook**      **Retail Stores**

Cllr Croucher reported that this was what used to be the Somerfield's Store. The rear area had always been used for deliveries & he could not envisage any problems.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

65/07.13

**F 40046/1/FUL/BH**      **Single-storey extension to rear & porch to front**      **Mr Paterson**  
**Cllr P Wilson**      **- 46 Longmoor Rd, Liphook**      **& Ms Rowe**

Cllr Wilson reported that the proposed work would convert the house from two to three-bedrooms & add a dining room. It was in a large plot & could only enhance the property. There would be a window in the side, but it would not overlook the neighbouring property.

**Decision:**                      No objections.

65/07.14

**F 40095/3/FUL/DM**      **Detached single-storey gatehouse with associated access**      **Greenbanks**  
**Cllr N Newman**      **& parking, following demolition of bothy - Hewshott**      **Homes Ltd**  
   **Grange, Hewshott Lane, Liphook**

Cllr Newman explained that the property was well within its own grounds, & could not be seen from anywhere except Old Barn Farm. The proposal was for the removal of a sub-standard cottage with a replacement in a different position. He was not sure whether the new building would be in the curtilage of the existing property, but apart from that he could not see any problems as it would also be single-storey.

**Decision:**                      No objection to the relocation of the bothy cottage provided that it remains ancillary to Hewshott Grange & does not become a new dwelling in the countryside.

65/07.15

**F 50086/1/FUL/DM**      **Two-storey detached dwelling with associated access &**      **Mr & Mrs**  
**Cllr N Newman**      **parking, following demolition of bungalow - Hewshott**      **Russell**  
   **Grange Cottage, Hewshott Lane, Liphook**

Cllr Newman reported that this could also not be overlooked by anywhere other than Old Barn Farm. It would be a replacement for the existing bungalow & appeared to be within the curtilage of the bungalow, although it was hard to determine due to the nature of the garden. It would be a substantial house which was required for family use in conjunction with Hewshott Grange.

Cllr Croucher pointed out that it would be twice the size of the existing bungalow.

**Decision:**                      No objection to the re-siting of the dwelling provided it falls within the permitted extension allowance, is ancillary to Hewshott Grange & does not become a new dwelling in the countryside.





3. at no time should the ancillary accommodation unit be let or sold separately from the Coach House.

**66/07.4**

**F 39464/FUL/AE**  
**Cllr P Wilson**

**Two-storey extension to rear/side, extend garage & porch to front, following demolition of single-storey extension to rear - 19 Hollycombe Close, Liphook**

**Mr & Mrs**  
**Cornelius**

Cllr Wilson stated that the house was in substantial grounds & was not overlooked on any side. There was plenty of land between the garage & the neighbouring property, & the extension would enhance the appearance of the house.

**Decision:** No objections.

**66/07.5**

**F 49847/1/FUL/SY**  
**Cllr P Wilson**

**Retention of 1.8m boundary wall & entrance gates - 5 Tylston Meadow, Liphook**

**Mr & Mrs**  
**Petrillo**

Cllr Wilson claimed that the streetscene was predominantly green - trees, bushes & hedges. The wall was in a very prominent position &, as it was bright red, had great impact & looked out of place.

**Decision:** Object to the retention of this boundary wall as out-of-keeping with all the surrounding properties & the layout of the estate.

**66/07.6**

**F 50456/FUL/DM**  
**Cllr M Croucher**

**Increase roof height to provide first-floor accommodation, single-storey extension to rear - Sungarth, Liphook Rd, Passfield**

**Mr & Mrs**  
**Lock**

Cllr Croucher stated that the house was in quite a large plot. The work would make it larger than the neighbouring houses, but should not affect their light. Most of the surrounding houses had had extensions.

**Decision:** No objections.

**TREE APPLICATION**

**66/07.7**

**F 36064/1/TPO/AMP**  
**Dr M Evans**

**Prune oak tree - 17 Meadow Close, Liphook**

**Mr & Mrs**  
**Finn**

Dr Evans reported that the oak was a substantial, high amenity tree in the garden of 17 Meadow Close. It was very close to the bungalow, which was built underneath its canopy around 40 years ago. The tree was now dropping a huge amount of debris into the garden, rendering it almost uninhabitable. It was also overhanging other gardens & power-lines. He could see no obvious signs of disease. He considered that the best approach was to clean the tree of dead-wood & remove any large hazardous branches, & reduce the tree to encourage the canopy to re-grow.

**Decision:** No objections - recommend cleaning tree of all dead-wood & removing any large branches likely to fall on houses/power-lines. Would also recommend reducing the tree by 20-30% to encourage the canopy to re-grow.

**67/07 RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (See Appendix 1)**

These were noted.

**68/07 PLANNING APPEALS**

**18a - 22 Longmoor Rd, Liphook (F 21860/9/FUL/JM)**

It was noted that the appeal by Peak Quality Homes (re: refusal of planning permission for 13 dwellings with associated access & garaging, following demolition of 20 Longmoor Rd) would be dealt with at an Informal Hearing (date/location TBA). The original Parish Council comments (see Appendix 2) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate. The Chairman reported that a member of the public had suggested that the Parish Council should ask the Inspector to make his site visit during term-time when the children were either arriving at or leaving Bohunt School. This was agreed.

**Site of 51 London Rd & 15 Tower Rd, Liphook (F 23717/8/FUL/JM)**

It was noted that the appeal by McCarthy & Stone Developments Ltd (re: refusal of planning permission for 27 sheltered apartments with communal facilities, car parking, associated access & landscaping, following demolition of two dwellings) would be dealt with at a Public Inquiry (date/location TBA). The original Parish Council comments (see Appendix 2) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

**51 Chitley Lane, Liphook (F 39438/4/LBC/JN)**

It was noted that the appeal by Mr & Mrs J Suter (re: refusal of planning permission for demolition of garage & gateway) had been allowed.

**69/07 SITE VISIT**

**6 & 7 Eleanor Close, Passfield (F 49674/2/FUL/GC; F 49725/2/FUL/GC)**

It was noted that an EHDC site visit would take place at 9.15am on Friday 20 July 2007 (re: planning applications for two-storey extension to rear; single-storey extension to front & conservatory to side).

**CONCLUSIONS**

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10.15pm.  
Confirmed at the meeting held on 20 August 2007.

Signed . . . . .  
Presiding Chairman

**ORIGINAL PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS (15.1.2007; 11.12.2006)**

**F 21860/9/FUL/JM**    **13 dwellings with associated access & garaging,**    **Peak Quality**  
**Cllr J Walters**    **following demolition of 20 Longmoor Rd - 18a-22**    **Homes**  
**Longmoor Rd, Liphook**

**Decision:**

Continue to object on the following grounds:

11. still strongly object to any extra vehicular movement opposite the entrance to Bohunt School (a secondary school with 1,200 pupils) for safety reasons;
12. grave concerns re: viability of proposed drainage as site & all surrounding properties are often waterlogged, in particular concerned about the possible effect on properties to the west along Longmoor Rd;
13. the Longmoor Rd drainage system is inadequate for the existing houses; further houses could only worsen the situation (see drainage conditions imposed as part of permission for development of the site of 94 & r/o 98-102 Longmoor Rd (F.37866/003/OUT));
14. over-development of the site;
15. backland development which would be out-of-keeping with the surrounding area & would set a precedent;
16. concerned about inaccuracies in Design & Access Statement - paragraph 5 of first page incorrect as there is no available access to The Grove, which is a private road;
17. would wish to see a landscape management plan to protect wildlife in the open space area.

**F 23717/8/FUL/JM**    **27 sheltered apartments with communal facilities,**    **McCarthy & Stone**  
**Cllr M Croucher**    **car parking, associated access & landscaping,**    **(Developments)**  
**following demolition of two dwellings (revised**    **Ltd**  
**scheme) - site of 51 London Rd & 15 Tower Rd,**  
**Liphook**

**Decision:**

Continue to strongly object on the following grounds:

10. gross over-development;
11. object to the mass, height & bulk of the three-storey buildings, which are inappropriate on this prominent site;
12. on-site parking provision is totally inadequate for residents of 27 flats plus visitors, staff & visiting staff (suggest underground parking could help to overcome this issue);
13. site unsustainable as not served by adequate public transport;
14. insufficient recreational gardens;
15. design is verging on institutional & does not contribute to the street-scene;
16. density is too high;
17. object to lack of traffic management at junction of London Rd & Tower Rd, especially as permission has recently been granted for 8 flats on the site opposite.

Strongly recommend a site visit.