



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 21 NOVEMBER 2005**

MINUTES

PRESENT WERE:

Cllr Mrs A James (Chairman), Cllr S Coyte, Cllr N Atherden, Cllr M Croucher, Cllr F Dawkins, Cllr L Futcher, Cllr W Ratcliffe & Cllr J Walters. Cllr S James (EHDC), Mrs C Darter (Parish Tree Warden), Mrs G Spencer (Information Officer), one member of the press & 16 members of the public also attended.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 OCTOBER 2005

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

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Cllr Futcher asked whether there had been any developments on the Village Design Statement (Item 17). The Chairman replied that there had not. Cllr Futcher reminded members that it had been suggested that a Forum was held in November. The Chairman replied that there had been delays in the Village Appraisal which meant that progress on the Village Design Statement had also been delayed.

4. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman reported that three further applications had been received since the agenda had been sent out & that, as all three were for large developments, the Parish Council had requested an extension of time within which to submit comments to EHDC & had deferred the applications to the next meeting on 12 December 2005.

Two of these applications were for Old Thorns Golf & Country Club, namely a full application for 34 holiday cabins & an outline application for a conference centre/hotel extension, & the third application was an outline application for 14 dwellings at 51 London Rd/15 Tower Rd. She reminded members of the public that, although the Parish Council had been given a time extension, members of the public would still need to submit their comments by the date shown on the notification letters.

She reminded members that Daryl Phillips, the new EHDC Head of Planning Development, would be meeting Parish Councillors at 7pm on 12 December, before the Planning Committee meeting, & that members should advise the office staff of any questions they would like to put to Mr Phillips. Cllr Coyte clarified that the meeting was just for councillors to meet Mr Phillips, not a public meeting.

The Chairman 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

**F 21479/12/FUL/JR Building for B1 use (light industry) - Passfield
Cllr Mrs A James Business Centre, Lynchborough Rd, Passfield**

APPLICANT

**Backhawk
Developments
Ltd**

The Chairman reported that none of the neighbours objected to this application, their only concerns were the likely resultant increase in traffic. They were in the favour of using the two entrances to create a one-way traffic system, with one entrance used for vehicles to enter the site & one for them to exit it. They also wanted sleeping policemen between the two entrances, a pedestrian refuse by the junction with the Passfield Rd, which had been promised but not built yet.

Cllr Atherden asked how many potential employees would work on the site. The Chairman advised that the current site housed 41 tenants with a total of around 140 employees, most of whom were local. There were currently no vacant units on the estate. She added that the proposed building would be lower than the existing adjacent building so it would not be seen. It had many windows, including some floor-to-ceiling windows, to make the building more attractive.

Cllr Futchter asked whether the new building would be for the use of a new company or for the extension of an existing company. Cllr Coyte replied that there were many firms on the estate & therefore it seemed likely that the new building would be let to several different small firms.

He added that the introduction of a one-way system could increase the traffic flow past the houses, & that a two-way system slows traffic down & encourages drivers to be more cautious. He considered that this was an appropriate site for the proposed building & fully supported the

application. He thought that it might be wise to impose restrictions on late night working as the site was close to a residential area.

Decision: No objections but would request that:

1. sleeping policemen be installed along the length of Lynchborough Rd;
2. the scheduled improvements at the junction with the B3004 are implemented;
3. restrictions imposed on working times in order to prevent traffic at unsociable hours, as the site is close to a residential area.

F 38968/1/FUL/SY Single-storey rear extension - 5 Manor Fields, Mrs Kilian
Cllr W Ratcliffe Liphook

Cllr Ratcliffe stated that he had spoken to the applicant & to one neighbour. He had left a note for the other neighbour, but had not received a response. The extension would form a fairly small addition to the house, which was one of a staggered terrace. It would not be seen from either neighbouring property & his only concern was that one side would be against a party wall. The meeting was then adjourned to allow the applicant to confirm that building regulation issues would be resolved once planning permission was obtained & that the extension would be built in the same grey bricks as the rest of the house. The meeting was then reconvened.

Decision: No objections provided materials are in-keeping with existing & Building Regulations take into account the fact that this extension would be built against a party wall.

F 39769/1/FUL/JN Conversion of garage to living accommodation & Mr & Mrs
Cllr S Coyte detached double garage - 1 Willow Close, Liphook Turner

Cllr Coyte told members that the previous application had involved a two-storey extension which was refused as it was considered to form an unacceptable enlargement of the property & to be out-of-keeping with the design of the dwelling. This application did not include that extension & the garage had been moved closer to the house in order to overcome highway concerns. The Parish Council had not objected to the previous application provided that the hedge was retained to provide screening. He proposed that the same comment should be submitted for this application.

Decision: No objections provided hedge retained to provide screening.

F 40109/FUL/JN First-floor side extension above existing garage Mr Atkin
Cllr L Futcher - 41 Huron Drive, Liphook

Cllr Futcher explained that the property was at the end of Huron Drive, backing onto Chiltlee Close & Manor Fields. He claimed that the extension would result in the house becoming a square building, similar to many of the surrounding houses. The window on the side would be obscure glazing & would therefore not affect the adjacent neighbours, & the window at the rear would not be a problem as the houses in Chiltlee Close were at a much lower level as the land slopes away.

Cllr Atherden claimed that the extension would improve the design of the house.

Cllr Coyte pointed out that it would mean that yet another three-bedroom house would be lost. He was concerned that it could set a precedent & result in a development that no longer matched the brief, in terms of comprising a mixture of house sizes.

Decision: No objections but are sorry about the loss of a three-bedroom house.

F 40126/OUT/JR Outline application - two pairs of semi-detached M Bromley

Cllr J Walters dwellings (after demolition of existing bungalow) & B Mason
- 3 Erles Rd, Liphook

Cllr Walters explained that the site was a corner plot, currently housing a bungalow. The proposal, an outline application, was to demolish the bungalow & replace it with two pairs of semi-detached houses with parking spaces which, he considered, did seem to be over-development of the site. He thanked Mr Ward, an Erles Rd resident, who had compiled a comprehensive report detailing the history of the site & covenants effecting it, as he claimed that the document had saved him immeasurable work.

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

Firstly, Mr Ward (9 Erles Rd) claimed that there had been ten previous applications for the site, all of which had been rejected, & two of them had gone to appeal & been dismissed. The first application had been for a pair of semi-detached two-storey dwellings in a similar layout to the current application. He added that the planning authorities had been 'worn down' by the continual applications & had eventually granted permission for a bungalow on part of the original site, which was now 7 Erles Rd. His objections included concerns about the visual impact, contravention of covenants, invasion of privacy, over-bearing appearance, highway safety (five entrances onto the road), out-of-keeping with surrounding properties & being forward of the building line.

Mrs Bell (16 Erles Rd) agreed with all of Mr Ward's comments & was also concerned that there would be a double drop-down kerb directly opposite her driveway & that it would be difficult to reverse out onto the road.

Mr Bell (16 Erles Rd) added that the proposal took infill to ridiculous extremes, that the access was wholly unacceptable into a narrow road on a 90° bend, the front doors would open virtually onto the pavement & there were no rear gardens.

Ms Bias (6 Erles Rd) anticipated problems with children playing in the road as there would be many parked cars. She was also concerned about additional usage of water, as there were currently many burst water mains in the vicinity.

Mr Neaves (1 Erles Rd) also agreed with the points raised by Mr Ward, & stated that the proposed development was unsympathetic with the area & far too densely populated. He claimed that Liphook had an ageing population & these were not the sort of properties that elderly people would want. He considered that the houses, although they were semi-detached, would look like a terrace as they were so close to the road.

The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Walters claimed that the application constituted gross over-development of the site. He read out a couple of pertinent comments that the Inspector had made, & stated that the Parish Council should recommend the application be refused.

Decision:

Strongly object on the following grounds:

1. gross over-development;
2. inappropriate sub-division of plot;
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;
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.

Additionally, would like to draw attention to the following statement, which Inspector made when dismissing appeal for similar application in 1986: "... *any new development should*

very precarious position on the top of a steep slope down to the River Wey & also fairly close to the house, & therefore dangerous.

Decision: No objections - it is a very large old tree with many dead branches & a large bracket fungus at its base, suggesting that the tree has heart rot & is dying. It is in a very precarious position on the top of a steep slope down to the River Wey & also fairly close to the house, & therefore dangerous.

**F 40121/CAT/AMP To fell dead Cupressus trunk & prune various Mrs Patrick
C Darter ornamentals - Osborne House West, 2 Portsmouth
Rd, Liphook**

Mrs Darter had no objections to this application. She explained that the Cupressus was a very large multi-trunked old tree with one trunk dying, which should be removed. There were also a number of small trees which required pruning. She added that she had not actually measured the trees & they might only be marginally large enough to require permission (the requirement being to have a trunk with a diameter of over 75mm at 1.5m above the ground).

Decision: No objections - the Cupressus is a very large multi-trunked old tree with one trunk dying, which should be removed. There are also a number of small trees which require pruning, as described in the application.

7. ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS

There were none.

8. RESULTS OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS (See Appendix 1)

These were noted.

9. PLANNING APPEALS

51 London Rd & 15 Tower Rd, Liphook (F 23717/4/FUL/JP)

It was noted that appeal by McCarthy & Stone Developments Ltd (re: refusal of planning permission for 35 sheltered apartments) would be dealt with at an Inquiry (date/location TBA). Original Parish Council comments (see Appendix 2) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

41 Church Rd, Bramshott (F 26854/2/FUL/JN)

It was noted that appeal by Mr Alderton (re: refusal of planning permission for change of use from agricultural use to domestic garden use) would be dealt with at an Informal Hearing (date/location TBA). Original Parish Council comments (see Appendix 2) had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

**10. HANTS CC MINERALS & WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK -
STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT - PUBLIC
CONSULTATION**

The Chairman reported that the Parish Council had looked at various drafts of Minerals & Waste Statements of Community Involvement. When responding to the

first draft, the Parish Council had suggested local radio as a media to consult the public & she was pleased to see it included in appendix 2 of the final version. She proposed that the Parish Council should continue to support this document as, although not very much of it would affect the Parish, the Parish Council would be notified should something arise that could affect it. This was agreed.

11. THE SURREY WASTE PLAN - PREFERRED PLAN/STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT - PUBLIC CONSULTATION

It was agreed to delegate responsibility to Cllr Atherden to read the documents & respond to Surrey CC, by 12 December 2005, re: any aspects that might affect Bramshott & Liphook Parish.

12. WEST SUSSEX CC - MINERALS DEVELOPMENT PLAN: ISSUES & OPTIONS - PUBLIC CONSULTATION

It was agreed that Cllr Walters would read the documents to determine whether any aspects might affect Bramshott & Liphook Parish, & recommend the Parish Council's response to West Sussex CC at the next meeting on 12 December 2005.

13. DRAFT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR HOUSING - FORMER KING GEORGE'S HOSPITAL SITE (see Appendix 3)

Cllr Atherden stated that his initial thought was that the residents would be fairly isolated from the rest of the community.

Cllr Walters claimed that it was a very important piece of land & it must be looked after properly. Cllr Coyte replied that a retirement home, with one point of contact, could be the best solution in that respect.

Cllr Atherden considered that three-storey buildings would be out-of-keeping & inappropriate. The Chairman replied that there had been four-storey buildings on the site originally & she thought that four-storey 'stately home' type buildings would be appropriate for apartments, but not for individual houses.

Cllr Walters referred to the section which claimed that the affordable housing should be spread throughout the development & genuinely "peppercotted", rather than being grouped in blocks. He stated that this was imperative & should not be ignored, as had been the case on the former OSU site.

Cllr Fatcher stated that at the public exhibition in September, the developer had talked about locating the affordable housing off-site. Cllr Fatcher disputed this as he considered that there was insufficient space off-site to accommodate that many houses & he therefore thought that the Parish Council should support on-site affordable housing.

Cllr Coyte pointed out that the Development Brief did not appear to include the Penally Farm land to provide a cycle link to Hewshott Lane. There was discussion about the boundary between the site & Radford Park, & the possible gifting of land to the Parish Council.

Cllr Croucher pointed out that the Development Brief referred to the Radford Park Meadows SINC adjacent to the site, & stated that Hants CC should be consulted about the appropriate treatment of it. He proposed that the River Wey Trust &, indeed, the Parish Council should also be consulted.

Both Cllrs Walters & Atherden claimed that the transportation measures formed a key part of the Brief.

Cllr Coyte disputed that the proposed 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling was adequate, given the location, & proposed that 2 parking spaces would be more appropriate. Cllr Croucher claimed that underground parking would be good for the apartments as it was a beautiful setting which should not be ruined by having parked cars in view. Cllr Coyte added that underground parking also offered the advantage of providing secure parking. Cllr Croucher asked whether the parking allocation included visitor parking & the Chairman replied that it did in the plans for the retirement village. It was agreed that the landscape of this extremely important site, with its parkland setting, should not be spoilt by parked cars, & that they should therefore be underground & hidden from view. There was discussion about whether or not underground parking would be suitable for houses as well as for apartment blocks.

Cllr Dawkins claimed that it was inappropriate that three-strand barbed-wire fencing was currently used on some of the site boundaries & that all barbed-wire fencing should be replaced with either rustic fencing or hedges. Cllr Coyte pointed out that it would be difficult to cultivate hedging under trees.

Cllr Coyte suggested that the site should have a single-point hidden satellite dish with an associated cable-system to serve the whole site, in order to prevent a multitude of unsightly satellite dish appearing all over the site.

Cllr Croucher asked where the Parish Council's developer contributions would come from. The Chairman replied that they would be under 'recreation provision'. It was agreed that this should be changed to 'recreation & community provision', in order to include projects such as the LMC Phase II refit.

It was agreed that the Parish Council should request the following changes/additions to the developer brief:

1. Comprehensive Masterplan (page 4) - the first bullet point should read "Principal roads and access points";
2. Layout & Design (page 4) - the last sentence of the first paragraph, about the landscape providing the starting point for the design, should be emphasised;
3. Layout & Design (page 4) - the second paragraph should state that the apartments could be four-storey, but individual houses should be restricted to a mix of one- & two-storey;
4. Landscape & Environment (page 5) - the fifth paragraph about cycle links should state that pedestrian paths & cycle ways should link the site to Hewshott Lane & Liphook;
5. Landscape & Environment (page 6) - the Brief refers to Radford Park Meadows SINC which is adjacent to the site, & states the treatment of the SINC should be resolved in liaison with Hants CC. The River Wey Trust & the Parish Council should also be consulted;
6. Parking (page 7) - the first paragraph refers to achieving an average of 1.5 car parking spaces per dwelling across the District - this site should have an average of 2 due to its remoteness from the Village Centre;
7. Parking (page 7) - the second paragraph refers to parking outside individual plots/communal parking to be arranged in landscaped courtyards - because of the landscape of this extremely important site, in this parkland setting, cars should not be seen & should therefore be underground, hidden from view;
8. Developer Contributions (page 10) - the second bullet point should read "Open space/landscaping and recreation & community provision";

9. A section should be added re: satellite dishes - the site should have a single-point hidden satellite dish with associated cable system to serve the entire site, in order to prevent a multitude of unsightly satellite dish appearing all over the site.

CONCLUSIONS

This concluded the business of the meeting & the meeting closed at 9.55pm.
Confirmed at the meeting held on 12 December 2005.

Signed
Presiding Chairman

Original Parish Council comments (18.7.2005; 15.8.2005)

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

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 26854/2/FUL/JN **Change of use from agricultural use to domestic** **Mr Alderton**
Cllr S Coyte **garden use - 41 Church Rd, Bramshott**

Decision:

No objection to the swimming pool, but the land should remain outside the settlement boundary & designated as agricultural land, in order to prevent further development within this enlarged plot.

APPENDIX 3