



LISS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held at 19.30hrs on 15 August 2018.

MEMBERS

Cllr Halstead *Cllr Budden *Cllr Linsley Cllr Hargreaves
*Cllr McDonald *Cllr Wright *Cllr Jerrard *Cllr Mayo

*Present.

*Chairman

The meeting was clerked by F Cook, Assistant Parish Clerk.

P104/18 Apologies: Apologies were received from Cllr Hargreaves.

P105/18 Declarations of interests:

- 105.1 Cllr Budden advised that as a member of the EHDC Planning Committee he would refrain from any vote required.
- 105.2 Cllr McDonald advised that as a resident of St Mary's Road she would refrain from any vote required on the planning application relating to The Oaks, 35 St Marys Road.

P106/18 SDNPA Planning Applications Received for Consultation

- 106.1 **18/04095/DEM – The Oaks, 35 St Marys Road – Demolition of existing buildings**
The Chairman noted that a number of members of the public were in attendance who wished to speak on this application. The Chairman confirmed that following discussion, the meeting would be adjourned so that the members of the public could address the meeting but informed the members of the public that once the meeting had been reconvened the members of the public would not be permitted to make further comments.

The Chairman informed the meeting that the committee had received concerns from residents in writing and noted that these included concerns regarding:-

- the number of construction vehicles using St Marys Road
- the adequacy of parking on site and on St Mary's Road
- the hours of working and disturbance to residents
- health and safety issues regarding the handling and removal of asbestos on the site
- health and safety issues regarding potential burning on the site
- health and safety issues regarding heavy construction traffic on a road used as a play area by children
- the availability of a contact to whom the residents will have access to register complaints about the works as they are being undertaken

The Chairman asked the committee members for their initial thoughts before adjourning the meeting to hear the views of the public attendees.

Cllr Mayo expressed the view that the number of vehicle movements anticipated/expected as set out in the document was under-represented and stated that he thought it would be significantly higher than this.

The Chairman expressed concern that there are only two parking spaces on site which was insufficient for the number of vehicles likely to be on site during the works and given the already crowded nature of St Marys Road.

Cllr Wright expressed concern that there was insufficient information about the protection of the two trees subject to TPOs on the right of the drive during the demolition works especially as large/heavy vehicles were anticipated on site.

Cllr McDonald expressed sadness that the building would be lost as she felt it had architectural merit. The Chairman reminded the meeting that the property was not listed and nor was it on the list of “Buildings of Local Historic Interest” which would make it very difficult to argue that the building or the façade should be retained.

Cllr Linsley expressed concern that usually a demolition application is accompanied by a planning application so that the future use of the land is known. Cllr Budden reminded the meeting that there was no obligation on the application to put in a planning application for development at the same time as an application for demolition. Cllr McDonald reminded the meeting that in section 4 it stated that the future use being proposed is an “extra-care development” subject to obtaining planning permission.

Cllr Wright expressed concern that the application gave no information as to what was to happen to the boundary trees and expressed the view that the green boundary should be retained.

The meeting was adjourned at 8.42pm.

Mr Neil Simpkins of 31 St Marys Road, address the meeting first. He advised that his property was within The Oaks hedge boundary and made the following comments:-

- that he was concerned that as the last application was refused on grounds including that the proposed building was not in keeping with the existing buildings on the site, the application for demolition means that there will be no buildings on the site to compare the application for redevelopment when it is remade.
- the building is quite attractive and structurally sound and so should be retained.
- the building could be converted and used as a family home without demolition and this would be preferable.
- that he was concerned at the asbestos in the building and how it will be handled. He expressed the opinion that a proper asbestos survey be carried out and the asbestos should be removed by fully licensed contractors prior to the demolition works taking place.
- that he was concerned for the safety of children who play in the road given the amount and likely size of the construction traffic which will be using St Marys Road.
- that although his property was within the hedge boundary of The Oaks, he had not received notification of the demolition application.

The Chairman thanked Mr Simpkins for his comments.

Mr John Morris of 25 St Marys Road then addressed the meeting and expressed the following concerns:-

- the safety of children playing given the additional construction traffic and the size and weight of vehicles.
- damage to the road surface caused by the construction traffic as it is shortly to be resurfaced.
- damage to the houses close to the road caused by vibrations from the construction traffic.
- the inadequacy of the number of parking spaces on the site.
- asbestos in the building.
- the possible burning of wood on-site

The Chairman thanked him for his comments and noted that the method statement indicates that no burning will take place on the site.

Mr Rodney Fisher of 3 St Marys Road expressed concern that the road was to be resurfaced in November and that the construction works would damage the new road surface.

Mr Richard Hopes of 20 St Marys Road asked what the demolition period was and Cllr McDonald informed him that according to the documentation the demolition works will start on 17 September 2018 and will end on or before 26 November 2018. Mr Hopes stated that there are not just children whose safety may be compromised by the vehicles movements in St Marys Road and noted that there were pets and wildlife (deer) also.

Mr Morris asked if there were obligations to keep the road clean and tidy and the Chairman confirmed that the method statement indicated that the road would be regularly swept.

Mrs Morris of 25 St Marys Road stated that her concern was the timing as there was concern that the demolition traffic would damage the road surface which is due for resurfacing shortly.

Mrs Hilary Horgan of 33 St Marys Road reiterated the comments in her email regarding asbestos being safely disposed of and no burning to take place on site.

The Chairman thanked all the members of the public for their attendance and their comments and reminded them that once the meeting had been reconvened they could no longer make comments or representations to the meeting.

The meeting was reconvened at 8.02pm

Cllr Jerrard expressed concern over the asbestos and the bats.

Cllr Wright expressed concern at the underestimation of the amount of traffic and the inadequacy of the on-site parking. She also expressed concern over the potential damage to the TPO trees and that they should be properly protected.

Cllr Mayo noted that there was no traffic management scheme with the documents and recommended that we request two banksmen – one for the Station Road end of St Marys Road and the other at the entrance/exit of the site itself.

Cllr Linsley expressed concern that some Councillors again had problems opening documents and so could not access all the on-line information and the Chairman pointed out that an inability to access the documents would not prevent SDNPA/EHDC from determining the application.

Cllr McDonald reiterated that she felt the committee should try to protect the building / the building's façade as it is characterful but Cllr Wright noted that as it is not listed or in the Liss list of significant historic buildings the committee could not push this particularly hard.

Cllr McDonald expressed concern at the working hours. Cllrs Budden, Mayo and Wright all expressed the view that these were standard “working hours” for the building trade.

Cllr Budden noted that the difficulty with commenting on the method of demolition was to ensure that the matters commented on can be enforced so an alteration to working hours would be unlikely to succeed as it would be difficult to enforce whereas a request for a traffic management scheme/plan was likely to be more successful as this was more easily

enforceable.

Cllr Mayo noted that there are insufficient grounds on which LPC can object to the demolition and so it is only the method of demolition that LPC can object to.

The Chairman noted that the documentation referred to the works being carried out by “whispering plant” and “muffled equipment” and expressed the view that there should be a condition that such plant and equipment are used to reduce the noise pollution from the site.

Cllr Wright reminded the meeting that the hedge boundary is an important area of green amenity and should be retained.

Following further discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the demolition application but should respond to the application as follows:-

LPC regrets the loss of a characterful building in a residential area of the village and whilst LPC appears to have no grounds to object to the demolition, LPC does have concerns over the method of demolition and in particular the following which need to be addressed:-

1. LPC believes that a full and comprehensive asbestos survey should be carried out to determine the extent of the asbestos in the property.
2. LPC believes that any asbestos identified in the asbestos survey should be removed from the property by fully licensed contractors in accordance with Health and Safety legislation and guidelines prior the demolition of the building.
3. the provision of two parking spaces on site during the demolition works is insufficient especially as there is limited parking available on St Marys Road. Vehicles waiting or parking in St Marys Road would cause the residents of the road great inconvenience.
4. as there are bats on the site, legislation regarding the protection of bats should be complied with.
5. given the current problems with sight lines and parking at the junction of St Marys Road and Station Road, the congested nature of St Marys Road and the frequent presence of children playing in St Marys Road, LPC believes that there should be a documented Traffic Management Plan for the demolition traffic especially as there will be no facility for site traffic to wait on Station Road before entering the site.
6. in addition to 5 above, LPC believes there should be a condition that two banksmen are provided during the demolition period. One would be at the Station Road end of St Marys Road and the other at the site entrance/exit.
7. LPC is concerned that the works should be completed prior to the scheduled resurfacing works to St Marys Road. Hampshire County Council is intending to resurface St Marys Road (having just resurfaced the pavements) in November 2018 and LPC is concerned to ensure that the demolition works are completed prior to the resurfacing being carried out as the demolition traffic is likely to damage the road surface.
8. LPC is concerned to ensure that the demolition vehicles are limited in size, weight and speed on St Marys Road. There is concern as children play in the road and wildlife including pets are also commonplace in the road. In addition, heavy vehicles and vehicles moving too fast can cause vibrations which may cause damage to houses in St Marys Road.
9. LPC notes that two trees on the site have been made the subject of Tree Preservation Orders since the original application was made. LPC is concerned that these trees are properly protected during the demolition period.
10. LPC notes that there is no mention of the hedge boundary to the site in the documentation provided as part of the application. LPC is of the opinion that the hedge boundary has great value as a green amenity and that the hedge should be protected and retained.
11. LPC notes that some residents are concerned to ensure that all underground cables and

services are not affected by the demolition works. LPC believes there should be a condition that all services and utilities should not be interrupted by the demolition works especially the broadband cables to the dwellings in St Marys Road which is believed to run through the site.

12. Given the proposed working hours, LPC notes that the applicant intends to use “whispering plant” and “muffled equipment” to carry out the demolition. LPC believes that this should be a condition of the planning consent to ensure that noise pollution is kept to a minimum.
13. LPC notes the method statement commitments for no burning on site, daily removal of waste and for road sweeping. All these must be conditioned and strictly enforced.

106.2 **18/02681/HOUS – Batts Brook, Hawkley Road – Single storey side extensions, new entrance porch, replacement garage with games room over**

Having discussed the application **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD OBJECT** to the planning application for the following reasons:-

- 106.2.1 notwithstanding the amended plans, the scale and height of the garage is excessive and will dominate the site.
- 106.2.2 there is no physical or functional link between the replacement garage with games room to the main dwelling which gives rise to concerns that it may be used as accommodation separate from the main dwelling
- 106.2.3 the size of the extension, together with previous alterations, appear to exceed the 50% rule under Policy H16
- 106.2.4 the amended plans are incorrect/inconsistent. The plan entitled “Garage – Ground and First Floor Plans – Proposed” (Drawing number 04A) shows the proposed first floor as having a roof with velux windows. The plan entitled “Garage Elevations – Proposed” (Drawing number 05A) shows the East and West Elevations as having velux windows but the North and South Elevations show a dormer window. Drawing number 05A should be amended to remove the dormer window from the North and South Elevations and confirmation should be sought from the applicant that the windows to be installed are all velux windows and that there will be no dormer windows
- 106.2.5 if minded to grant the application, a condition should be added that the use of the garage and games room over, must remain ancillary to the use of the main dwelling.

The meeting was closed at 20.30 pm.

.....
Chairman

Next Meeting: 29 August 2018 at 7.30pm