



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 19 JULY 2010.

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs A James (Chairman), Cllr Mrs B Easton, Cllr Dr S Judge, Cllr N Newman, Cllr Ms J Poole & Cllr P Wilson. Dr M Evans (Parish Tree Warden), Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer), one member of the press & 32 members of the public also attended.

68/10 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

She then explained that the Committee would discuss any applications that members of the public had come to listen to first. 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.

69/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr P Jordan.

70/10 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 14 JUNE 2010

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

71/10 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were none.

72/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman read out the Declaration & asked whether members had any interests to declare. The following declarations were made:

- Cllr Dr Judge declared a personal & prejudicial interest in the tree work application for Bohunt Manor as the application was connected to the proposed new medical centre (Minute 74.10.18);

- Cllr Mrs Easton declared a personal & prejudicial interest in the tree work application for the woodland adjacent to the railway in Hammer Vale as the site was in close proximity to her land (Minute 74/10.20);
- 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 solely as a Parish Councillor.

73/10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION

Public Questions (items not on the agenda). None.

Members’/Public Participation (Code of Conduct, Paragraph 12 (2)). None.

Public Participation. None.

74/10 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

APPLICANT

74/10.1

**21539/004 Retention & continued use of land as residential garden Mr & Mrs
Cllr N Newman - Bell House, Limes Close, Bramshott Cruickshank**

Cllr Newman reported that the application related to approximately an acre of land, designated as agricultural, which was adjacent to Bell House. The applicant claimed that the land had not been used for agriculture for many years, that the previous occupier grew lupins there & that it currently included a vegetable garden. There were no other buildings in the vicinity & no other access to the land. However, there had been a couple of similar applications in Bramshott in the past, which had been refused permission & subsequent appeals had been dismissed.

Decision: Object to the inclusion of the paddock into the residential curtilage of the house.

74/10.2

**21589/070 Detached building for 51 hotel apartments - Old Thorns Golf Old Thorns Golf &
Cllr N Newman & Country Club, Weavers Down, Liphook Country Estate**

Cllr Newman reported that there was currently a bungalow on the site, but the proposal was to replace it with 51 hotel apartments. He had spoken to many of the local residents who had voiced concerns about many other areas on the estate, including the amenity field, pond, drainage, common tracks & road, but at this meeting the Parish Council would only be discussing this application. The apartments would be a mix of three & four-storey blocks. They would look fairly imposing, but were not quite as bad if considered in relation to the size of the other buildings on the site. The end of the new building would probably be visible from Longmoor Rd &, in winter when the trees were bare, from the other direction as well. Foul water sewerage was an area of contention, but the application stated that EHDC had not informed Old Thorns of any such problems. This had been disputed by local residents. Another major concern was about the amount of traffic this development was likely to generate. The application included the results of a traffic survey which predicted, based on a two-thirds occupancy, that an additional 33 movements per day would be generated. Other concerns raised included light pollution, noise pollution (reference had been made to proms nights & fireworks), the size/bulk & inappropriateness for the countryside. He considered that Old Thorns’ standard of buildings had, so far, been exemplary. He thought that three/four-storeys was too high per se but, because of the slope of the land, they would be marginally lower than the existing building. The application had advised that building less or lower would not be commercially viable.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow members of the public to comment on the application: Firstly, Mr Barnes (Dunoon, Longmoor Rd) claimed that his property had been affected by foul water sewerage problems which had led to the 2001 Thames Water work to upgrade the system. The root of the problem was that there was only a six inch main & the system had not been built to accommodate the Bircholt Rd development or Old Thorns. The Parish Council had objected to an earlier Old Thorns application (21589/052 for hotel extensions, conference centre & staff block) for 13 reasons which included sewerage problems. These problems were well known & local residents had been supported by both local councillors & MPs.

Mr Seabrook (Woodlands, Hazeldene Rd) claimed that a drainage company had been called out recently as Old Thorns' car park had flooded. These apartments would have two double bedrooms & could therefore have four occupants, & this could only exasperate the drainage problems.

Dr Tough (Horseshoes, Griggs Green) was concerned about increased traffic. He was a Transport Consultant & disputed the predicted traffic figures. He also considered that this would constitute over-development, would be inappropriate for the site (looked like a row of beach huts) & would be seen from the golf course.

Mr Dixon (Heatherview, Hazeldene Rd) claimed that as this was a holiday development, occupants would be likely to make several journeys per day in order to visit local attractions. He added that EHDC's latest planning guidelines stated that there was no requirement for any further tourism development in the district.

Mr Blazye (Moorside, Pines Rd) lived adjacent to the playing field & was concerned that it would be used by the occupants, & that this would affect his privacy & create a noise nuisance.

Mr O'Keeffe (3 Fairway Close) was concerned that they could be changed to residential apartments. He also disputed the predicted traffic figures as the survey had been based on business guests who would not be representative of families in holiday accommodation.

Mr Popple (Flint Cottage, Hazeldene Rd) was concerned about the cumulative effect on the flooding problems & about where the flats would be visible from.

Cllr Newman stated that he lived in Queens Rd & was therefore very familiar with the site & with the changes over the years. He had walked the entire site & the golf course, & concluded that the only location from where they would be visible would be the old part of Longmoor Rd, although it would be different in winter.

Mrs Downs (7 Beechcroft Rd) confirmed that the existing buildings could be seen from the houses in the winter.

Mr Gerrard (Coach House, Greatham) was a member of Old Thorns Golf Club & was concerned about the increased traffic, especially from a safety point of view. He also claimed that the design was hideous; it was too big, bulky & ugly on a beautiful site.

Mr Downs (7 Beechcroft Rd) was concerned about light pollution. He claimed that the loss of trees would remove the tree barrier & reduce privacy.

Mrs Horsley (51 The Maltings) worked at Old Thorns & she claimed that most wedding guests did not make multiple journeys to/from the site, & that Old Thorns needed to be developed in order to be commercially viable & provide local employment.

Mr Butterfield (Manager, Old Thorns) stated that this development would create more local employment & clarified that the figures provided in the application would be the total number employed by Old Thorns on the whole site. He added that many of the local people had been consulted about the development.

Mr O'Keeffe (3 Fairway Close) claimed that the cumulative effect of other applications for houses on Old Thorns land should be taken into account. He also claimed that there would be insufficient children's activities provided & he was concerned about the resulting impact on the environment.

Two of the younger Old Thorns employees present both claimed that there were many activities for all ages on site & that when children/teenagers stay in hotels they are generally thrilled to be there & are keen to take advantage of all the facilities on offer, such as the pool.

Mr Hill (the architect) stated that he would address all the concerns that had been raised:

Foul & surface water drainage - Old Thorns were aware of the sensitivity of this area & had engaged an independent company to investigate & planned to tackle both issues in consultation with EHDC & Thames Water.

Noise pollution - residents would self-police as they would not want to stay in a noisy environment.

Light pollution - the orientation of the building had been designed so that there were not any windows in the side facing the local houses.

Scale of development - the building was in a slight dip so that the ridge height would be marginally lower than that of the existing building. He also pointed out that Old Thorns had obtained an earlier permission for an extensive development before the surrounding houses had been built.

Traffic movements - it was highly likely that residents would not want to leave the site as activities had been planned to cater for all ages.

Cllr Mrs Easton stated that the Parish Council should take account of the comments made by members of the public.

Cllr Dr Judge stated that the survey had been completed by business people &, in her view, families in holiday apartments would be much more likely to be in & out of the site.

The Chairman asked whether they would be self-catering apartments; Mr Butterfield confirmed that they would be.

Cllr Wilson felt that the Parish Council should support Old Thorns as they had done much for the area.

Cllr Newman asked how much would be spent on the development; Mr Butterfield replied £28 million.

The meeting was then reconvened.

The Chairman suggested that the Parish Council should state support for Old Thorns, but object to this application for all the reasons raised by the local residents. A vote was taken & all were in agreement.

Decision:

Whilst the Parish Council supports the commercial viability of Old Thorns, would wish to object to this application for the following reasons:

1. over-development of site;
2. height, bulk & inappropriate design, unsympathetic to this beautiful site in the countryside;
3. not sustainable as no public transport;
4. question the predicted 33 trips per day for 51 apartment buildings as unsure whether they are self-catering holiday flats or hotel apartments, as those in self-catering holiday flats would be likely to use the South Downs & other facilities in the area for a holiday;
5. concerns re: proven need (not financially viable) for further hotel accommodation as Liphook Service Station just granted permission for hotel accommodation;
6. concerns (noise) re: use of the amenity area to accommodate holiday families;
7. concerns that flats could become residential in the future, given staff block has been changed to provide further guest accommodation;
8. strong concerns re: cumulative effects of development on this site on the foul sewer drainage system & surface water run-off to nearby properties;
9. object to car parking on tree-side of staff block (light/noise pollution).

74/10.3

23545/001 **Two-storey extension to rear - Greenways, Bramshott Chase** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr Mrs B Easton **Road, Bramshott Chase** **Harmer**

Cllr Mrs Easton reported that, although there was only a very small back garden, the proposed extension was fairly small. It would be quite close to the adjacent property, but there was a high wall between the two.

Decision: No objection.

74/10.4

25198/008 **Two-storey extension to side with detached double garage** **Mr Wickham**
Cllr P Jordan **to side - 1 Chase Villas, Seven Thorns Lane (formally**
Portsmouth Rd), Bramshott Chase

Cllr Ms Poole, on behalf of Cllr Jordan, explained that the Parish Council had previously agreed that the house should be recognised as two flats. The site was very large & any work could not affect anyone else. One flat was spread over three floors & the other was on just one. The proposal was to make the flats significantly larger. Cllr Jordan had considered that the proposals looked fine & he could not see any reason to object.

Decision: No objection.

74/10.5

26154/004 **Renewal of extant outline permission 26154/003 - two-link** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr P Jordan **detached dwellings, following demolition of bungalow** **Weston**
- Pemberton, Longmoor Rd, Liphook

Cllr Ms Poole, on behalf of Cllr Jordan, reported that the Parish Council had not objected to the original application &, as nothing had changed, there was no reason to object to this renewal.

Decision: No objection.

74/10.6

26854/008 **Detached agricultural barn - land north of Westering &** **Mr & Mrs**
Cllr N Newman **west of Church Rd, Bramshott** **Bicknell**

Cllr Newman claimed that this was a genuine small holding & that the application was for an appropriate barn, which would be sited in the corner of the field.

Decision: No objection.

74/10.7

29407/002 **Pitched roof over existing single-storey extension** **Mrs Kavanagh**
Cllr P Wilson **- 69 Haslemere Rd, Liphook**

Cllr Wilson explained that the extension had been a garage, but under an earlier permission had been converted into a room. It had the original flat roof, which the applicant now wanted to replace with a pitched roof which would line up with the roof of the house. Cllr Wilson claimed that it would be a great improvement.

Decision: No objection.

52153
Cllr P Jordan
/Cllr Ms Poole

Outline application - two-storey extension to existing dwelling & new two-storey detached dwelling - Vernon Cottage, Hazeldene Rd, Liphook

The executors of the late Mrs Dixon

Cllr Ms Poole had visited the site with Cllr Jordan. She explained that Vernon Cottage was originally designed to be a pair of semi-detached dwellings, but the second half had never been built. At present there was a car port & a single-storey extension on either side, & the proposal was to demolish them & replace the car port with a two-storey extension & the single-storey extension with a separate detached two-storey dwelling. She had been unable to contact the neighbour on the car port side, but considered that the extension was unlikely to affect them. The new dwelling, however, would be quite a substantial house, built right up to the boundary with the adjacent small cottage, 2 St George's Cottage. She considered that the Parish Council should object to the this new dwelling as it would cut the light to & harm the amenity of 2 St George's Cottage, & would also lead to an increase in traffic & exasperate existing drainage problems.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow Mr Popple (Flint Cottage, Hazeldene Rd) to comment on the application. He lived opposite the site & was concerned about being overlooked. He claimed that the additional hard-standing would exasperate the current flooding problems, which occurred as the road was unmade with no in-built drainage. He added that the road was very narrow & that the new house would be at only the wider point, thus removing the only place were cars could safely pass or turn round. The meeting was then reconvened.

A vote was taken & all were in agreement that the Parish Council should object to the application.

Decision:

No objection to extension to original dwelling to replace single-storey car port.

Object to substantial new dwelling as reaches boundary line of adjacent property, 2 St George's Cottage, constitutes over-development of the site & would be detrimental to the amenities of 2 St George's Cottage. Object to cumulative effect on the drainage system in the area & additional run-off from this property onto the road which has no built drainage.

79/10

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

The Railway Hotel, Station Rd, Liphook (E.H. 841 - 15.12.2009)

It was noted that a provisional TPO on a Horse Chestnut tree on the SE boundary of the Railway Hotel & to the north of Liphook Railway Station had been confirmed without modification.

80/10

STREET NAMING & NUMBERING

Development of nine houses on site of 20/rear of 18a-22 Longmoor Rd, Liphook

The Chairman explained that EHDC had asked the Parish Council to comment on the proposed street name: "*Copperwood Road*". The Clerk had contacted the Preservation Society to ask for input & had been advised that "*Close*" would be more appropriate than "*Road*".

Decision: Agreed to reply that the street name should be "*Copperwood Close*" or "*Copperwood End*", as this would convey the cul-de-sac nature of the road.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 10.50pm.

Confirmed at the meeting held on 16 August 2010.

Signed
Presiding Chairman