



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 13 JUNE 2005.**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs A James (Chairman), Cllr S Coyte, Cllr N Atherden, Cllr L Futchter & Cllr J Walters. Mrs C Darter (Parish Tree Warden), one member of the press & four members of the public also attended.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

were received from Cllr M Croucher, Cllr F Dawkins & Cllr W Ratcliffe.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 16 MAY 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 reported the outcome of the Royal Anchor appeal – the car park had been allowed but the application for houses had been dismissed. The Inspector had decided that the garden, although not listed, was essential to separate the Royal Anchor from the houses in Victoria Way. She thought that it was good that the car park was allowed as it would facilitate future expansion of the Royal Anchor. She

thanked the Planning Committee, the Preservation Society & all the people in Liphook who had been involved, especially Cllr Walters for all his input. Cllr Walters said that thankfully the Inspector had made his decisions based solely on planning issues, as less than ten people from the Council & the public had attended, & Cllr Walters was appalled by this lack of support .

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 25463/1/CDP/PF Cllrs Coyte	Certificate of proposed lawful development & conversion of loft to provide additional living accommodation with dormer to rear – 24 Chiltley Way, Liphook	Mr & Mrs Roberts

Cllr Coyte explained that this was an application for a Certificate of Lawful Development, rather than a planning application, as the applicant had claimed that the proposal was within their permitted development rights. The site was on the Berg Estate, an area of Special Housing Character as defined by EHDC’s Local Plan Policy H9. The proposal involved creating living accommodation in the roof space, with a large dormer window at the rear & two velux windows at the front. He did not see a problem with the dormer at the back as it would not overlook anyone & there were already many dormers on the Georgian houses on the Estate. He was however concerned about the velux windows at the front as they would be out-of-keeping with the street scene.

Cllr Walters considered that the proposal contravened the spirit of Policy H9 as it would alter the character of the house &, as the Estate comprises a mixture of single-storey chalets & two-storey houses, 2½ storeys would be out-of-keeping.

Decision: Object to this application as consider that the introduction of a third floor would be out-of-keeping with the Berg Estate, an area of Special Housing Character (Policy H9), & the two front velux windows would be out-of-keeping with the street scene.

F 31007/3/FUL/JP Cllr S Coyte	Four semi-detached dwellings after demolition of builder’s yard & creation of access – 2-4 Longmoor Rd, Liphook	F Mulcahy & Sons
--	--	-----------------------------

Cllr Coyte compared the layout of the current application with that of the previous outline application, which the Parish Council had approved at an earlier meeting. He showed that the houses on plots 3 & 4 had been brought forward in front of the building line of the adjacent bungalow, 6 Longmoor Rd, in order to accommodate car parking spaces behind the houses. Previously the car parking had been at the front, with a garden area behind. He claimed that the designs were bland & considered that chimneys were needed to break up the rooflines & be in-keeping with the surrounding houses. He also criticised the white plastic windows.

Cllr Atherden claimed that it was important to retain the character of the area. The Chairman considered that the gardens should be at the rear in order to afford maximum enjoyment to the residents.

Cllr Atherden added that the layout would mean the houses would protrude & dominate the adjacent bungalow.

Decision: Object to this application as the site layout is not as agreed in the earlier outline application (F.31007/2/OUT/JP) & wish to see houses 5a & 5b in-line with the adjacent bungalow, 6 Longmoor Rd, as the height of the proposed houses would be overbearing on the bungalow. The design is crucial as it is adjacent to the Conservation Area in The Square & would wish to see chimney pots in-keeping with the rest of the street scene & brown windows in-keeping with the remainder of Camino Terrace.

F 33548/1/LBC/SY Internal alterations & refurbishment – The Tap Mr Newbery
Cllr Mrs A James House, The Square, Liphook

The Chairman explained the proposed alterations & summarised them as exquisite. Cllr Coyte proposed that the decision should be made by the EHDC Conservation Officer. Cllr Walters agreed that was the correct procedure but considered that reassurance was needed to ensure that regular inspections were conducted. The Chairman agreed to check that regular monitoring took place.

Decision: No objections provided that EHDC's Conservation Officer conducts regular inspections of the work carried out, as this is an important listed building in the centre of Liphook's Conservation Area.

F 39806/FUL/JN Two-storey extension to side – 1 Manor Fields, Mr & Mrs
Cllr N Atherden Liphook Powers

Cllr Atherden explained that the house was at the beginning of a row in a staggered layout adjacent to the footpath which leads into the main part of Manor Fields. He had spoken to several surrounding residents, none of whom had raised any objections to the proposed extension. He explained that the extension would continue the staggered layout, although the corner would not form a right-angle due to its close proximity to the boundary line. He could see no reason to refuse the application; the only problem was that a section of hedge along the boundary would have to be removed.

The Chairman queried the materials being used under the bay window, as the drawings appeared to show tile-hanging, & it was important not to introduce any new materials. Cllr Atherden replied that there was no mention of this in the application.

The meeting was then adjourned to allow the applicant to confirm that there would not be any tile-hanging & that he was planning to paint the outside, to match other surrounding houses, in order to minimise the amount of maintenance required. The meeting was reconvened.

Decision: No objections.

F 39859/FUL/SY Two-storey extension to side – 8 Court Close, Mrs Gray
Cllr N Atherden Liphook

Cllr Atherden explained the site was sufficiently large to accommodate the extension, the materials were in-keeping & the neighbours did not object.

Decision: No objections provided matching materials are used.

Decision:

Have to object to this application as strongly object to the conversion of an agricultural building in the field as would constitute a new dwelling in the countryside.

However have no objections to the proposed replacement dwelling provided permitted development rights are removed in order to prevent future accommodation in the roof-space, which would result in a total increase in size exceeding 50% of the size of the original building.

8. RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (see Appendix 1)

These were noted.

9. PLANNING APPEALS

Land west of Royal Anchor Hotel, fronting Longmoor Rd, Liphook (F 27205/16;17/FUL/JH)

It was noted that the appeal by Banner Homes (re: refusal of planning permission for 14 dwellings, associated roadways & garages) had been dismissed & the appeal by Green King plc (re: refusal of planning permission for formation of car park & associated roadway) had been allowed.

Land to rear of 49 Portsmouth Rd, Liphook (F 36948/2/FUL/JH)

It was noted that the appeal by Thermonovel Ltd (re: refusal of planning permission for detached dwelling) would be dealt with by Written Representations. 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 agreed that the Chairman would represent the Parish Council at the Public Inquiry on 15-17 June 2005 at the Liphook Millennium Centre. Cllr Atherden agreed to attend if he could.

10. CONSULTATION ON HAMPSHIRE MINERALS & WASTE ISSUES

Cllr Futchter reported that Hants CC had produced a draft document entitled "More from Less" which set out the County's plans for mineral & waste management throughout Hampshire. He stated that it was the a most impressive document which summarised an 18-month long stakeholder engagement process. He read out extracts from the document & from the newsletter "Hampshire – Planning for Minerals, Waste & Resources". He concluded that the keys points to emerge were:

1. it was vital to educate the public & that would require considerable expenditure;
2. the planning process should have commenced much earlier;
3. business & industry were lagging behind;
4. legislation would be necessary in order to successfully implement the proposals;
5. the current 'throwaway culture' needed to be eliminated.

Cllr Walters asked who would be responsible for implementing the proposals, & claimed that it should be a national initiative, not funded by council tax as it no doubt would be were the County to be responsible.

Cllr Atherden claimed that recycling should pay for itself by producing goods that could be sold, & gave examples of reclaimed building materials & compost made from garden waste. He considered that Hampshire should have timber recovery banks, which were present in other counties.

Cllr Coyte was in favour of legislation being introduced to return unwanted consumer goods to manufacturers for recycling.

The Chairman claimed that today's 'throwaway culture' had been encouraged by deliberate commercial policy, & thought that the amount of packaging in general, & free supermarket carrier bags in particular, should be minimised.

It was agreed that the Clerk should summarise the above points to form the Parish Council's response to the consultation.

11. CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL – LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (LDF) CONSULTATION

Cllr Mrs James explained that Chichester DC were preparing a Local Development Framework (LDF) to guide future development decisions. They were consulting the public & relevant organisations, both in the District & in adjoining areas, to ask whether they would like to be involved in the LDF preparation, & had sent a copy of their draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for comment.

The Chairman stated that the SCI appeared to be an excellent document which clearly set out how the Council intended to consult the public & relevant organisations, & that it proposed a very thorough consultation process. She read out the key points from the draft, including the proposed use of supplementary planning documents to focus the consultation on the most appropriate groups, the recognition of the key role to be played by Parish Councils in the planning process & the availability of planning officers to attend Parish Council meetings to explain particular planning applications. The document also mentioned South East Planning Aid (SEPA), an organisation which offered independent professional advice & help on town planning matters. The Chairman added that she had not heard of SEPA but would investigate further.

The Chairman explained that the Committee needed to decide whether the Parish Council wanted to be involved in the LDF consultation & whether they wanted to comment on the draft SCI. She recommended involvement & considered that the Parish Council should respond positively to the questionnaire about the SCI. It was agreed that the Parish Council should be involved & respond positively to the questionnaire.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 9.40pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on Monday 18 July 2005.

Signed
Presiding Chairman

Original Parish Council comments (21.2.2005)

**F 36948/2/FUL/JH
Cllr Mrs A James
Decision:**

Pre-decision amendment - detached two-storey dwelling - land to rear of 49 Portsmouth Rd, Liphook **Thermonovel Ltd**

Continue to object on the following grounds:

1. cramped site;
2. over-development of plot;
3. design unattractive & detrimental to the amenities of future occupiers;
4. still too near to significant amenity tree, & still resulting in loss of light to the new house;
5. too close to the gardens of 47 & 49 Portsmouth Rd, especially given their current joint permission for a rear extension to both properties;
6. undesirable backland development;
7. would set a precedent;
8. no additional car parking space to be provided for this house.