



## LISS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held at 19.30 hrs on 30 April 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.

**P46/18 Apologies:** Apologies were received from Cllr Hargreaves.

### **P47/18 Declarations of interests:**

47.1 Cllr Budden advised that as a member of the EHDC Planning Committee he would refrain from any vote required.

47.2 Cllr Budden further declared an interest in Forest Lodge and confirmed that he would refrain from taking part in any discussion and any vote in connection with that item on the agenda.

### **P48/18 Approval of Minutes of the Meeting on 26 March 2018**

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

### **P49/18 Approval of Minutes of the Meeting on 19 April 2018**

**Resolved:** The minutes of the meeting of 19 April 2018 be approved as a correct record. Proposed by Cllr Budden and seconded by Cllr McDonald.

### **P50/18 Matters Arising from Minutes of Meeting on 26 March 2018**

#### 50.1 Cala Homes – Planning meeting 12 April 2018

The Chairman informed the meeting that she and Cllrs Wright and Hargreaves had attended a meeting with the SDNPA to discuss their concerns with the application and that Cala Homes had subsequently had a meeting the SDNPA. The Chairman informed the meeting that following that meeting Cala withdrew the planning application. The Chairman informed the meeting that SDNPA and Cala Homes were now entering into a Planning Performance Agreement which would include a series of workshops with various parties including LPC, to work towards the preparation of a deliverable scheme for the Andlers Ash site.

#### 50.2 71 Station Road – Unauthorised Change of Use

The Chairman informed the meeting that a copy of a notice to Cllr Mike Kendall had been received regarding an alleged unauthorised change of use relating to Puddleducks Nursery. Cllr Linsley declared an interest in this matter by virtue of being a Trustee of the Newman Collard Playing Fields Trust and confirmed that he would take no part in the discussion or any vote. It was noted that the matter would be investigated and that there was no further action to be taken at present. Cllr McDonald had noted that some car parking was occurring on the site.

#### 50.3 Old Berry Grove Farm – unauthorised operational development

The Chairman informed the meeting that a copy of a notice to Cllr Mike Kendall had been received regarding an alleged unauthorised operational development which was the erection of a

boundary wall with planting 2.7-3m in height and solid gates 2.4m in height and the erection of a large structure in the rear garden. It was noted that the matter would be investigated and that there was no further action to be taken at present.

### **P51/18 SDNPA Planning Applications Received for Consultation**

#### 51.1 **18/01391/FUL – Land Between 29 – 35 Mint Road** – Two detached three bedroom houses, parking area and vehicular access

The Chairman informed the meeting that there were members of the public wishing to address the meeting. The Chairman then informed the meeting that planning permission had been granted in 2017 for the erection of a single dwelling on the property. The Chairman further informed the meeting that since then the Liss Village Neighbourhood Development Plan had been made and the property now fell outside the settlement boundary in the LVNDP where countryside policies apply.

The members then agreed a period of adjournment to take comments from the members of the public. The meeting was adjourned at 7.48pm.

The first member of the public made the following points:-

1. there was only one access point and no garages only parking spaces
2. the houses were further back than existing properties and so would be intrusive to neighbours
3. lack of parking generally means that visitors will most likely park on the road close to the speed bump which could be dangerous to other road users and pedestrians
4. she was concerned for the roots of the silver birch tree during and after the development
5. there are existing drainage issues with the site and surrounding properties and the development will only make these worse
6. by setting the houses further back they are now close to the stream which may be detrimental to the stream, its environment and ecology.

The Chairman thanked the member of the public for their comments.

The Chairman read out correspondence received from another member of the public who also pointed out that the property was no longer within the settlement boundary and expressed concern about the impact of any groundworks on the watercourse and harm being caused to the watercourse as a result of the proximity of the proposed buildings.

The Chairman read out correspondence received from another member of the public who made the following points:-

1. the plot was too small for two houses
2. the proposed houses are too close to the stream and will have a detrimental effect on the stream
3. as the houses were set further back than the existing neighbouring properties they would be intrusive to neighbours
4. expressed concern about the silver birch in the front garden. She noted that building materials were already been stored against and around the silver birch possibly causing damage and was concerned that if the application is successful, further building materials will be similarly stored potentially causing damage to the silver birch which has been at the property for a considerable length of time

The second member of the public in attendance:-

1. expressed great concern as to the effect and impact the proposed development would have on the biodiversity and ecosystems of the area and, in particular, the stream environment
2. stated that the proposed development was too close to the stream for the protection of both the houses and the stream
3. expressed concern with parking as previously heard as there is insufficient on-site parking

- and so cars will end up being parked in the road
4. expressed concern that the properties will be even higher than the surrounding properties because of the build-up/foundations required as a result of the land being boggy and that this would also create issues with “run-off” onto adjoining properties.

The Chairman thanked the member of the public for their comments.

The meeting was reconvened at 7.58pm.

Having discussed the application and considered the comments of the members of public attending and in correspondence **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD STRONGLY OBJECT** to the planning application for the following reasons:-

1. the property is outside the settlement boundary. If the 2017 planning permission had not been granted but was made at today’s date, it would not have been granted because the property is outside the settlement boundary. The fact that planning permission was granted for one property in 2017 does not justify increasing the development to two properties. Accordingly, under planning policy the additional house should not be permitted
2. the size and scale of the development combined with the proposed houses being set further back in the plots than the neighbouring properties, means that the proposed development would be obtrusive to neighbours, would reduce their light and detrimentally impact on the neighbours’ amenity.
3. the proposed raising in height of the ground level will increase the height of the proposed houses in relation to surrounding properties
4. there is concern that raising the ground level to mitigate flood risk to the proposed houses would result in an unacceptable increase in water run-off onto neighbouring properties at the lower level, in particular the adjacent cottage, number 29 Mint Road. LPC would proposed that should EHDC be minded to grant the application, that drainage works must ensure that no drainage onto neighbouring properties takes place
5. there is concern over the impact of the development on wildlife in the area both during and post construction. In particular, LPC notes the ecological value of the stream and has concerns that the proposed works may affect the quality of the habitat for wildlife within the property and downstream.
6. the Ecology Report is based on a site survey carried on in October 2016 and states that there are no badgers within a 2km radius. An adjoining property owner has informed us that there are both badgers and slow-worms within the vicinity and that she has seen both in her garden.

51.2 **18/01894/FUL – The Temple Inn – Erection of three three-bed terraced houses with associated landscaping, amenity space and parking, including proposed new car parking for the Temple Inn Public House and the demolition of existing public house outbuilding and toilet block**

The Chairman noted that there were members of the public wishing to address the meeting on the planning application for The Temple Inn and that for the convenience of the members of the public, that application would be dealt with next.

The members then agreed a period of adjournment to take comments from the members of the public. The meeting was adjourned at 8.15pm.

The first member of the public informed the meeting that he was there in support of the application as he felt that the proposed dwellings had been sympathetically designed to match existing nearby properties and that whilst the parking arrangement were a bit tight they were ok with sufficient parking spaces for the houses.

The Chairman thanked him for his comments.

The second member of the public was objecting to the application. She expressed concern that whilst there would be sufficient parking spaces for the houses, this was being achieved by reducing the parking available to neighbouring properties. She expressed that the loss of car

parking spaces in the lay-by would cause problems for residents and informed the meeting that some residents were already parking in the pub car park overnight and if this facility is removed they will end up parking on Forest Road which is already congested with parked vehicles. The Chairman thanked her for her comments.

The meeting was reconvened at 8.19pm.

Having discussed the application and considered the comments of the members of public attending **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application as whilst parking was an issue, the number of spaces allocated to the new houses was in-line with current planning requirements but a comment should be made that as a result of public concern at the loss of parking for other residents, the applicants may wish to consider making some of the pub parking accessible to local residents by having direct access to it from Temple Road.

- 51.3 **18/01325/HOUS – Cumbers Cottage, 33 Andlers Ash Road** – Single storey side extension  
Following extensive discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.
- 51.4 **18/01167/HOUS – The Old Rectory Farnham Road** – Conversion of Outbuilding to Holiday Let  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application but would request a condition that the outbuilding remains as a holiday let and does not subsequently change to become residential use.
- 51.5 **18/01452/HOUS – 20 Old School Road** – Orangery to rear  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.
- 51.6 **18/00717/HOUS – 1 Chilmark Court, Riverside Close** – Conservatory to rear  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application but would comment on the poor quality of the plans.
- 51.7 **18/01267/HOUS – Bashford Lodge, Hill Brow Road** – Single storey extension to side, replacement windows, re-cladding, new outbuilding and roof lights to watertank conversion following demolition of garage and storage shed  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application PROVIDED THAT:-  
51.7.1 the planning officer confirms that policy H16 has been complied with and  
51.7.2 a condition is made to the planning permission that the new outbuilding and converted watertank are not separately occupied and that the use of both the new outbuilding and converted watertank remain non-commercial and ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling,
- 51.8 **18/001519/HOUS – 20 Western Road** – Two storey rear extension  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD OBJECT** to the planning application for the following reasons:-  
51.8.1 the development will have a negative impact on the neighbours' amenity  
51.8.2 the development will result in loss of light to the neighbouring properties  
51.8.3 the extension will increase the number of bedrooms at the property but there is no associated increase in the provision of parking at the property. The under-provision of parking will result in additional on-road parking on a street which is already very congested with parked vehicles.

- 51.9 **18/01730/HOUS – 63 Mint Road – Single storey rear/side extension**  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application for the single storey rear/side extension. However it was noted that no additional parking appeared to have been provided when the additional room in the roof was constructed and consequently there is an under-provision of on-site/off-road parking. If this planning application is to be granted, then there should be an obligation to provide an additional off-road parking space at the front of the property in view of the extent of this application and the works undertaken following the previous planning permission.
- 51.10 **18/01499/HOUS – Shelomar, Plantation Road – Enlarge bay window in length to side of dwelling**  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.
- 51.11 **18/01531/HOUS – Crouch Readons, Rake Road – Single and two storey rear extension**  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application PROVIDED THAT the planning officer confirms that policy H16 has been adhered to.
- 51.12 **18/01414/HOUS – The Shaw, Pruetts Lane – Two storey extension to side and glazed atrium to rear**  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application PROVIDED THAT:-  
51.12.1 the proposed development complies with policy H16  
51.12.2 all proper measures are taken before, during and after construction to protect the bats  
51.12.3 that the annex is not to be let or sold separately and that its use will always be residential and ancillary to the residential use and occupation of the main dwelling.
- 51.13 **18/01926/HOUS – The Limes, Lime Close – Internal alterations to existing habitable loft space, larger windows to existing dormers and addition of roof lights**  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.
- 51.14 **18/01896/HOUS – Forest Lodge, 15 Pine Walk – Proposed dual pitched roof to existing garage with self-contained living accommodation and associated works**  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD OBJECT** to the planning application for the following reasons:-  
51.14.1 the proposed development is an over-development of the property  
51.14.2 the scale of the proposed annex would have a detrimental impact on the adjoining bungalow  
51.14.3 if minded to grant the application there should be a condition that the self-contained living accommodation is not occupied separately from the main dwelling and that the use of the self-contained living accommodation is ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling.
- 51.15 **18/02020/HOUS – 139 Andlers Ash Road – Two storey side extension and internal alterations**  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application PROVIDED THAT the three parking spaces shown on the plan are provided on site.
- 51.16 **18/02055/HOUS – Kingsmere, Malvern Road – Removal of existing timber posts and gates and construction of new masonry all with automatic gate**  
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD OBJECT** to the planning application for the following reasons:-

- 51.16.1 the height of the wall is excessive and out of keeping with the surrounding area
- 51.16.2 the removal of the existing vegetation will be a loss of green environment and will result in an urbanisation of the area
- 51.16.3 if minded to grant the application, a condition should be added that replacement planting should be put in behind the wall to preserve a green environment.

### **P52/18 SDNPA Applications Approved**

It was noted that the following applications were approved

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/00748/FUL	40 Dennis Way	Front porch.
17/05793/HOUS	3 Dennis Way, GU33 7HJ	Retention of climbing frame with swings and slide to front of dwelling.
18/00392/HOUS	61 Mint Road, Liss, GU33 7DQ	Single storey rear extension, conversion of loft space and dormer to rear
18/00269/HOUS	White Stones, Hill Brow Road, GU33 7LQ	Three bay detached garage following demolition of two bay garage.
18/00884/CND	Blue Bell Inn, Farnham Road, GU33 6JE	Variation to condition 1 of application SDNP/15/01388/FUL to permit minor amendments to Plot 1 to permit substituted drawings 14/148/SK20B, 14/148/SK21B, 14/148/SK22 and 14/148/SK23 with 14/148/SK20D, 14/148/SK21C, 14/148/SK22A and 14/148/SK23A which have been amended to regularise amendments as constructed

Following discussion regarding the Blue Bell Inn, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC would write to the planning officer and the head of the SDNPA Planning seeking an explanation why the planning application has been granted despite the original officer's report stating that "the use of satisfactory external materials goes to the heart of the planning permission". As built, key recommendations in the adopted Liss Village Design Statement have been ignored. Cllr Budden informed the meeting that he would follow this up with the planning officer.

**P53/18 SDNPA Applications Refused:** None

**P54/18 SDNPA Applications Appeals:** None

### **P55/18 SDNPA Applications Withdrawn**

It was noted that the following application had been withdrawn.

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/00250/FUL	Snatch House, Farnham Road, GU33 6JZ	Four dwellings together with associated parking, access and landscaping works following demolition of the existing commercial building.
17/06506/FUL	Land north east of Andlers Ash Road, Liss	Erection of 77 dwellings.

### **P56/18 TPO Applications – Referred to the Tree Warden**

56.1 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.

18/01665/TPO	Public Open Space West and North of 8 Kiln Field, Liss	T2 – Oak – fell, T3 – Oak – fell, T4 – Oak – fell
--------------	--	---

**RESOLVED: LPC WOULD OBJECT** to these works as the trees have great importance for their environmental and landscape value and there is no proper justification for their removal as they are not damaged, diseased or dangerous.

56.2 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.

18/01574/TPO	7 Pine Walk	Ash tree – crown lift to 8-9m, Sweet chestnut – crown lift by removing the four lowest branches
--------------	-------------	---

**RESOLVED: LPC WOULD NOT OBJECT** to these works.

- 56.3 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.

18/01530/TCA	The Flat, Liss Delivery Office, 45 Station Road, Liss	Goat willow in rear garden – fell, smaller willow close to the right hand side fence – crown reduce by 30% to leave a finished height of 20-25ft and crown spread of 15-20ft
--------------	---	--

**RESOLVED: LPC WOULD NOT OBJECT** to these works.

- 56.4 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.

18/01785/TPO	The Larches, 4 Highfield Gardens, Liss, GU33 7NQ	Blue Cedar – reduce NW side only to 8m crown spread radius to leave live foliage of good artistic form. No height of tree to be removed.
--------------	--	--

**RESOLVED: LPC WOULD NOT OBJECT** to these works.

- 56.5 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.

18/02166/TPO	8 Pine Walk, GU33 7AT	Yew T1 – fell and replant with one standard Rowan
--------------	-----------------------	---

**RESOLVED: LPC WOULD NOT OBJECT** to these works.

#### **P57/18 TPO Applications Approved**

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

18/00800/TPO	10 Highfield Gardens, Liss, GU33 7NQ	Holly – reduce height by 3m. Ash – reduce height by 2m and spread by 1m. Oak – reduce crown by 2m. Beech – reduce height by 3m and lateral over road by 1m. Oak – reduce crown by 2m. Lawson Cypress (x2) reduce height by 3m
--------------	--------------------------------------	---

#### **P58/18 TPO Made**

It was noted that no TPOs had been made.

#### **P59/18 Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan Monitoring**

It was noted that this was on-going and that no action was currently required.

#### **P60/18 Any Other Business**

##### 60.1 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.

##### 60.2 Fish and Chip Shop

It was noted that there had been numerous complaints about the alterations to the frontage of the Fish and Chip Shop and that these works within the Liss Conservation Area did not have planning permission. Cllr Budden confirmed that he had raised this with the Enforcement Department at EHDC.

The Chairman circulated a letter from Mr Harris and confirmed that Mr Harris had given permission for his letter to be forwarded to EHDC.

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC WOULD OBJECT** to the works in strong terms to EHDC Planning Enforcement noting the breach of EHDC's Shop Fronts Design Guide and in particular policy 10 of the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan which requires that “development within the retail area of the Liss Village Conservation area must respect and enhance the variety and character of the existing shop fronts”. Policy 10 further requires that, “Development relating to shop fronts in the Liss Village Conservation Area must reflect the traditional local character and distinctiveness of shop front design”. Recommendation 4.3 of the

adopted Liss Village Design Statement states: “Planning policies to protect Conservation Areas should be strictly applied. This should include period shop fronts, which should be conserved using their original features and detailing, and employing sensitive decoration, signing and lighting.”

The letter would request that EHDC take enforcement action to ensure that the new shop frontage is removed and the original frontage is reinstated.

60.3 Harveys Solicitors, 96 Station Road

The Chairman informed the meeting that she had been advised by a neighbouring occupier that the upper floors of the property are being occupied for residential purposes despite consent for converting the upper floors into flats having been refused. Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** LPC would write to EHDC Planning Enforcement and notify them of the possible residential occupation and use.

60.4 NPPF

Cllr Wright asked whether the current consultation being undertaken on the NPPF could provide an opportunity for LPC to highlight concerns about planning procedure. Cllr Budden confirmed that EHDC and SDNPA were submitting comments but that parish councils were not being consulted. The consultation relates to policy and not to procedure. Cllr Wright asked how LPC could make comments on procedure and Cllr Budden confirmed that he would look into this matter and report back.

60.5 SDNPA Local Plan

The Chairman informed the meeting that the SDNPA had put in its Local Plan for approval.

60.6 Kingdom Hall

The Chairman informed the meeting of correspondence received regarding the planning application for Kingdom Hall and the effect on parking. Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT** the correspondence be passed to the Highways Committee.

The meeting was closed at 9.15 pm.

.....  
Chairman

**Next Meeting: 25 June 2018 at 7.30pm**