



LISS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held at 19.30 hrs on 26 March 2018.

MEMBERS

Cllr Halstead *Cllr K Budden *Cllr H Linsley Cllr Hargreaves
*Cllr McDonald *Cllr A Wright Cllr Jerrard

*Present.

*Chairman

The meeting was clerked by F. Cook, Admin. Officer.

Three members of the public also attended.

P32/18 Apologies: Apologies were received from Cllrs Jerrard and Hargreaves.

P33/18 Declarations of interests: Cllr Budden advised that as a member of the EHDC Planning Committee he would refrain from any vote required.

P34/18 Approval of Minutes of the Meeting on 26 February 2018

Resolved: The minutes of the meeting of 26 February 2018 be approved as a correct record. Proposed by Cllr Wright and seconded by Cllr McDonald.

P35/18 Matters Arising from Minutes of Meeting on 26 February 2018

35.1 P22.8 - Cumbers Cottage – Certificate of Lawful Development

Whilst it was noted that the minutes of the meeting of 26 February 2018 were a correct and accurate record of the meeting, it was noted at the Full Council meeting on 19 March 2018 that the Planning Committee had erred in paragraph 22.8 in stating that the property is outside the settlement boundary. Accordingly, the meeting **RESOLVED THAT** the words “it believes that planning permission should be sought rather than a Certificate of Lawful Development as the property is outside the settlement boundary” be deleted from the minutes.

35.2 P103/17 – Lack of Parking Policy – EHDC and SDNPA

The meeting noted the letter received from NALC and circulated to the committee and that there was no further action to take at this stage.

35.3 P22/18 22.1 – 6 Silver Birch Close, Liss, GU33 7HP

The Chairman read out a letter from Mr and Mrs Bond regarding the Planning Application made in respect of 6 Silver Birch Close, Liss, GU33 7HP, the contents of which were noted and had been acknowledged. The Chairman reminded the meeting of the comments already submitted in response to the Planning Application.

P36/18 SDNPA Planning Applications Received for Consultation

36.1 18/00614/HOUS – 99 Station Road – Single and two storey rear extension, Alteration to loft, Creation of mezzanine, Removal of existing roof covering, Replacement of vertical tile with cedar boarding, New triple garage, Conversion of integral garage and brickwork to be rendered

Cllr Halstead informed the meeting that as there were members of the public wishing to address the meeting on the planning application for 99 Station Road and that it was convenient that application was first on the agenda.

The members then agreed a period of adjournment to take comments from the applicants. The meeting was adjourned at 7.40pm.

The applicants provided background information as to why the application had been made and indicated that it was to provide an additional bedroom to enable members of the extended family who lived away to stay when they visited. The new garage was to replace the one being converted to provide more living space. The applicants stated that the property would still have

a large enough garden and that there was no intention to remove any trees or hedges at the property, particularly those at the front screening the property from the road. The applicants informed the meeting that even with the new garage there was plenty of room on the driveway to manoeuvre so that exiting onto the road would be done forwards rather than in reverse. The applicants also confirmed that it was the intention to build the garage last to ensure that the construction traffic would be parked on site and not on the road.

The Chairman thanked the applicants.

The meeting was reconvened at 7.49pm.

Having discussed the application and considered the comments of the applicants **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application.

36.2 **18/00269/HOUS – White Stones, Hill Brow Road – Three bay detached garage following demolition of two bay garage**

Following extensive discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application.

36.3 **18/00748/FUL – 40 Dennis Way – Front Porch**

Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application but should comment that the description of the application was poor as it only states “Front Porch” when the application includes the construction of a downstairs WC.

36.4 **18/00715/FUL – Westwood House, London Road – Single residential unit**

Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC strongly object to the planning application for the following reasons:-

1. the proposed development is outside the settlement boundary and is against Policy 19 of the Joint Core Strategy which provides that “The approach to sustainable development in the countryside, defined as the area outside settlement policy boundaries, is to operate a policy of general restraint in order to protect the countryside for its own sake. The only development allowed in the countryside will be that with a genuine and proven need for a countryside location, such as that necessary for farming, forestry, or other rural enterprises”. Policy 19 also provides that “The emphasis in the Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy is therefore to allow development in the countryside where it can be demonstrated that a countryside location is both necessary and justified.”
The applicant has not demonstrated that the construction of a dwelling outside the settlement boundary is “both necessary and justified.”
2. the proposed development is outside the settlement boundary and is against Policy 1 of the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan which provides that “Development will not normally be permitted outside settlement policy boundaries except in exceptional circumstances. It is an important way of protecting the character of the village and conserving the landscape and countryside around it”.

IT WAS ALSO RESOLVED THAT this application be brought to the attention of the Link Officer.

36.5 **18/00250/FUL – Snatch House, Farnham Road – Four dwellings together with associated parking, access and landscaping works following the demolition of the existing commercial building**

Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should strongly object to the application for the following reasons:-

1. the use of the property should not be changed to residential use and the property should remain with a commercial use. The Liss Neighbourhood Development Plans notes that “A survey of existing businesses shows that the many small businesses in Liss want flexible space that can be adapted to changing needs” and “the plan supports the development plan policies which encourage business development”. Further the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan notes that “Apart from opportunities to use existing land in business parks more intensively...there is no land available for new business use”. LPC objects to the change of use to residential as this would result in the loss of valuable

commercial property within Liss.

2. If minded to grant the change of use to residential use, LPC objects to the proposed application for the following reasons:-
 - 2.1. the proposed design of the four dwellings is completely unacceptable for this location within the historic West Liss Conservation Area for the following reasons:-
 - 2.1.1. The design is not traditional as described and is not landscape led as required by SDNPA Policy. The application should identify how the houses relate to the street and their boundary enclosures, preferably using traditional materials and not faux materials – i.e. tiles and brickwork should be made from clay and not cement based mono-coloured substitutes. The porches should reflect the local distinctiveness. The flat brick arches are not “subtle”. The treatment of the fronts should link the houses so that they form part of a “street” and are not seen as isolated dwellings and should reflect an appropriate distance from the back of the pavement to the house, similar to adjacent dwellings.
 - 2.1.2. the development should avoid deep-plan layouts that cause the construction of high-pitched roofs. If a deep-plan is considered necessary, then the use of a roof shape with a centre valley should be considered like many other dwellings in Liss and thus reducing the bulk of the roof shape. In addition deep-plan tends to result in fenestration that is horizontal in proportion and this does not comply with the Village Design Statement where there is a traditional emphasis on vertical fenestration.
 - 2.1.3. the embellishments of the house design should be constructed from a careful choice of materials such as flint, appropriate facebrick selection or even rendered wall finishes, recessed window character with sub-sills and appropriate eaves projections and roof finishes to make the dwellings of a more traditional house design.
 - 2.1.4. all of the above comments stem from the Policy 9 of the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan which provides that “development must meet the highest standards of design and make a positive contribution of the character of Liss. Proposals must respect and enhance the built character of the village and its high-quality countryside setting.”
 - 2.2. access to the development is very poor and would have adverse effects on the users of Church Street
 - 2.3. the brick wall along the boundary of the property on Church Street is of visual importance within the village and should not be removed.
 - 2.4. the property is higher than the surrounding area which should be borne in mind when granting consent particularly with regard to the proposed roof heights of the development and therefore high-pitched roofs should be avoided.

IT WAS RESOLVED ALSO THAT this application be brought to the attention of the Link Officer.

36.6 **18/00763/HOUS – 37 Newfield Road – Proposed Workshop in Rear Garden**

Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC object to the planning application as the proposed development is over large for the site and there is a lack or/insufficient justification for the development. The development would also adversely impact on the immediate neighbours' light and as the proposed development is so dominant it will have an adverse visual impact on all neighbouring/nearby properties.

If SDNPA is minded to grant planning permission LPC would request that a condition be added that the workshop must not be used for any commercial/business purposes and that its use must remain ancillary to the residential property at 37 Newfield Road.

36.7 **18/00884/CND and 18/01132/CND – Blue Bell Inn – Variation to conditions and amended plans**

Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC would object to the planning application for the following reasons:-

1. the properties have not been built in accordance with the original planning permission.

- The applicant should be required to build the properties as per the original planning permission.
2. The officer report accompanying the 2015 application (SDNP/15/01388FUL) stated unequivocally that “the use of satisfactory external materials goes to the heart of the planning permission”. It is the absence of all the originally proposed critical elements, together with the introduction of horizontal windows instead of vertical ones, which have resulted in what is now regarded locally to be a totally unacceptable outcome. These three houses stand at a most prominent location in the most historic part of Liss where high quality design, detailing and materials should be paramount. As built, key recommendations in the adopted Liss Village Design Statement have been ignored.
 3. if minded to grant the permission, LPC requests that the applicant should stipulate how it intends to achieve the proposed alterations and that it is imperative that the detailing set out in the planning application is satisfactorily delivered. Therefore:-
 - 3.1. the applicant needs to stipulate how they intend to undertake the crenellation on the quoins. Crenellation is usually three courses of brickwork and with darker facebrick on the quoin. It would not be traditional to have brick slips added (stuck on) because they would project in front of adjacent brickwork and in frost might fall off unless mechanically fixed. The addition of raised quoins in plastic or synthetic material such as mineral fibre is considered unacceptable.
 - 3.2. the introduction of a vertical mullion in the front windows implies that windows will be replaced but this is unclear. How will it be possible to amend the widths of each casement or sash in order to introduce the mullion? A different lighter tone value for the grey for the mullion would emphasise verticality and separation of the window frames. The applicant should confirm whether or not the windows are being replaced.
 - 3.3. if a “wavy” fascia is re-introduced, then it would be helpful to have this information at a larger scale so as to see clearly how it is shaped, particularly the lower end.
 4. the original planning application provided for the rendering of Plot 2. LPC requests that Plot 2 be rendered as per the original planning application.
 5. LPC would also like to express concern that it was not consulted on the proposed external materials used. Condition 2 of the Planning Permission (SDNP/15/01388/FUL) provides that “no development shall commence until details and samples of the ... materials to be used in the development have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the SDNPA”. The reason given for this was “in the interests of visual amenity” and continues “it is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the use of satisfactory external materials goes to the heart of the planning permission”. As the materials to be used was such a material consideration LPC considers that it should have been consulted on the details and samples of materials.

IT WAS FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this application be referred to the Link Officer and to the two other District Councillors, Mike Kendall and Laetitia Pienaar.

- 36.8 **18/00895/HOUS – 1 Teachers Terrace – Single storey rear extension**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should object to the planning application as the proposed development is an over-development of the site as the extension takes up too much of the garden resulting in a cramped site and loss and lack of amenity space.
- 36.9 **18/00392/HOUS – 61 Mint Road – Single storey rear extension, Conversion of loft space and Dormer to rear**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application but seek confirmation that the development will be constructed in accordance with the parking plan forming part of the application.
- 36.10 **18/00687/FUL – Bottom House, Pruetts Land – Replacement two storey dwelling**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application but seek confirmation that it complies with the 50% rule set out in Policy H16.

- 36.11 **18/00702/HOUS – Tiercel, Brewers Lane – Single storey ground floor extension following demolition of single storey garage**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application provided that it complies with the policy for extension to properties outside the settlement boundary.
- 36.12 **18/00931/FUL – 180 Forest Road – Change of use from garage to single dwellinghouse, minor alterations and provision of two parking spaces with access from Briarwood Road**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should object to the planning application for the following reasons:-
1. The proposal provides insufficient parking and amenity space for an additional residential unit and will detract from the character and environment of the adjacent historic terrace.
 2. the original planning permission granted for the garage (dated 14 December 2006) contained the condition that the garage “shall be used for the parking of private motor vehicles and ancillary domestic storage only and for no other purpose”. The reason given for this condition was “to maintain planning control in the interests of amenity and/or to ensure adequate provision is maintained for the parking of vehicles clear of the highway”. These reasons still apply.
 3. the subsequent planning permission granted on 27 January 2010 (EHDC Ref. No. 38505/005) contains the condition that the building “shall be used only for parking private motor vehicles and ancillary domestic storage and for no other purposes. No part of the building shall be converted into habitable accommodation or used for any other use thereafter.” The reason given for this condition was “in the interests of highway safety and the amenity of nearby residents”. These reasons still apply.
 4. The Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan (Policy 5) provides that “Development proposals resulting in a net increase in residential units within 400m of the boundary of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA will be required to undertake a project-specific Habitats Regulations Assessment”.
 5. CP22 of the Joint Core Strategy also provides that “Any new housing that is proposed to be located within 400m of the boundary of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA will be required to undertake a project-specific Habitats Regulations Assessment” which “must form a part of the planning application process to demonstrate that either no adverse effect on the ecological integrity of the SPA will occur or that adequate measure will be put in place to avoid or (as a secondary solution) adequately mitigate any adverse effects”. Further CP22 provides that “Such measures must be agreed with Natural England and the planning authority”. No HRA has been undertaken and submitted with the planning application and, accordingly, no measures (if required) have been agreed with Natural England.
- 36.13 **18/00702/HOUS – Tall Trees, 5 Little Barn Place – Extension of double garage to include a workshop**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application.
- 36.14 **18/01027/HOUS – Red Walls, Plantation Road – Demolition and rebuilding of porch, replacement of flat roof with double hipped roofs and three roof lights**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application.
- 36.15 **18/01213/HOUS – 78 Newfield Road – Single storey rear extension**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application.
- 36.16 **18/01264/HOUS – 69 Mint Road – Single storey rear extension**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC should not object to the planning application.

P37/18 SDNPA Applications Approved

It was noted that the following applications were approved

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
17/04705/FUL	173 Station Road, GU33 7AW	Retention of change of roof of link/kitchen building to a double hipped roof with four veluxes instead of flat roof. Demolish and rebuild existing garage due to unsafe structure and damp issues, then use as extra living area. Revision of planning permission (SDNP/16/06256/HOUS)
17/05793/HOUS	3 Dennis Way, GU33 7HJ	Retention of climbing frame with swings and slide to front of dwelling.
17/06444/LDP	25 Patricks Copse Road, GU33 7DL	Lawful Development Certificate for a Proposed Development – Conversion of garage to form a dining room and conversion of workshop to form a bedroom and bathroom
17/05666/HOUS	41 Mint Road, GU33 7DQ	Conversion of garage, single storey extension to side of property, porch to front
17/04536/HOUS	3 Oak Tree Drive, Liss, GU33 7HW	Conversion of garage to form habitable accommodation, ground floor extensions to front and rear and first floor extension to front and side
18/00207/HOUS	164 Andlers Ash Road, Liss, GU33 7LS	Proposed new roof to garage and new entrance to driveway an modified driveway layout. Two velux roof lights and internal alterations
18/00236/HOUS	3 Hatchlands, Huntsbottom Lane, Liss, GU33 7EU	Single storey side extension

P38/18 SDNPA Applications Refused

It was noted that the following application was refused.

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/00320/PA3T	71 Station Road, Liss, GU33 7AD	Prior approval for proposed change of use from business (B1, C1, 2 and D2) to registered nursery

P39/18 SDNPA Applications Appeals

It was noted that the following application had been appealed.

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
17/01883/FUL	92 Andlers Ash Road, GU33 7LR	Existing dwelling to be subdivided, forming 2 dwellings, 2 storey extension and 1 detached dwelling within curtilage

Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVE THAT** LPC should write confirming its objection to the application and supporting the SDNPA's decision.

P40/18 SDNPA Applications Withdrawn

It was noted that the following application had been withdrawn.

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
17/00351/FUL	Saddlers, Farnham Road, Liss, GU33 6JU	Erection of one detached 3 bedroomed dwelling and one detached 4 bedroom house; alterations to existing site access from Church Street; provision o open and covered car parking and cycle stores including new covered car parking and cycle store for Saddlers; new hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments, and other works

P41/18 TPO Applications – Referred to the Tree Warden

41.1 It was noted that the following TPO had been referred to the tree warden. It was also noted that advice had been received from LPC's tree surgeon, Mark Welby.

18/01171/TPO	2 Beech Place, Western Road, Liss, GU33 7AG	Beech – Reduce lower laterals by 2m to leave a crown spread radius of 7m to suitable growth points. No reduction in height. Crown thin by 20%, Walnut – Crown lift to 5m and crown thin by 20%
--------------	---	--

Resolved: Liss Parish Council do not wish to object to these works.

41.2 It was noted that the following TPO had been referred to the tree warden. It was also noted that advice had been received from LPC's tree surgeon, Mark Welby.

18/01214/TCA	The Crofts, Limes Close,	Apple Tree (T1) – crown thinning by 30%, Apple Tree
--------------	--------------------------	---

	Liss, GU33 7DR	(T1) – Crown reduction to a total width of 5m and height of 4m (20% each way), Eucalyptus Tree (T2) – remove, Red Cedar (T3) – remove, Spruce Tree A (T4) – remove, Spruce Tree B (T5) – remove, Robinia pseudoacacia (T6) - remove
--	----------------	---

Resolved: Liss Parish Council do not wish to object to these works.

P42/18 TPO Applications Approved

It was noted that the following TPO applications had been approved.

17/06454/TPO	Camrose, The Mead, Liss, GU33 7DU	Horse Chestnut – crown reduction 1-2m leaving 12m height and 12m spread.
--------------	--------------------------------------	--

P43/18 TPO Made

It was noted that no TPOs had been made.

P44/18 Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan Monitoring

It was noted that this was on-going and that no action was currently required although it was also noted that copies of the final version of the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan were still awaited.

P45/18 Any Other Business

45.1 Terms of Reference

Following a brief discussion it was agreed that the members of the Planning Committee would review the Terms and Reference and discuss these at the next planning meeting, time permitting.

45.2 Parking Issue – Andlers Ash Road

The contents of the email from Ashton Carruthers at EHDC were noted regarding the parking of construction traffic on Andlers Ash Road.

45.3 Footpath Lighting

The contents of the email from a resident of Barnside way were noted and **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** the matter be passed to the Highways Committee.

45.4 EHDC Draft Statement of Community Involvement Consultation

The Chairman referred the meeting to the draft Statement which had been circulated to the Committee and its contents were noted.

45.5 House of Lords Select Committee

The Chairman referred the meeting to the Select Committee report which had been circulated and informed the meeting that amongst other things it recommends that other entities take responsibility for “rural-proofing” but that there was no action for LPC to take.

45.6 Cala Homes Application – Andlers Ash Road

The Chairman informed the meeting that it seemed likely that the application will be refused by the SDNPA.

45.7 TPOs

Councillor Budden informed the meeting that TPO decisions may be dealt with in future by the EHDC Planning Committee which appears to be the current trend. He informed the meeting that the EHDC Planning Committee were being given training on TPOs although the EHDC Planning Committee is trying to resist this.

45.8 TPOs Works Approved

The Administrative Officer informed the meeting that she had received notice of two TPO application approvals which had been received after the agenda had been circulated. She informed the meeting that these relate to 2 Chase Road and 5 Summerfield Terrace.

The meeting was closed at 9.35 pm.

.....
Chairman

Next Meeting: 30 April 2018 at 7.30pm