



LISS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held at 19.30hrs on 19 December 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.

Before the meeting commenced it was noted that two members of the public were in attendance to speak on the Burgates application. The Chairman explained the procedure to the members of the public prior to calling the meeting to order.

P164/18 Apologies: Apologies were received from Cllrs McDonald and Hargreaves.

P165/18 Declarations of interests:

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

P166/18 Approval of Minutes of the Meeting on 26 November 2018

Resolved: The minutes of the meeting of 26 November 2018 be approved as a correct record. Proposed by Cllr Budden and seconded by Cllr Wright and a unanimous vote.

P167/18 Matters Arising from Minutes of Meeting on 26 November 2018

- 167.1 Update from Meeting with Rogate re Proposed Flying Bull and Rakelands Development
The Chairman briefly summarised the meeting with Rogate and informed the meeting that Rogate were unaware of the scheme to put houses on the front part of Rakelands. The outcome of the meeting was that both parties would keep a watching brief on both Rakelands and the Flying Bull and noted that the proposed new access may be an issue.
- 167.2 The Chairman also mentioned Heathmount and informed the meeting that she understood that it was being advertised as hostel-type accommodation and that EHDC enforcement were investigating this to ensure that it is short stay hostel/Air B & B - type accommodation, which would not require planning permission for change of use rather than a House in Multiple Occupation which would. It was noted that the access to the property was in West Sussex but that the building itself was in East Hants.
- 167.3 Bluebell Pub Sign
The Assistant Clerk informed the meeting that as the Land Registry search had not been successful, she had written to the brewery regarding the sign and was awaiting a response. The Chairman informed the meeting that the Historical Society were happy to archive the sign if it was considered to be of merit.
- 167.4 Response from Russell Oppenheimer
The Chairman read out the response from R.O. and this matter was discussed. It was agreed that the situation was not acceptable when HCC Highways won't engage in policy making such as the Neighbourhood Plan or in pre-app advice such as the Cala Homes application at

Andlers Ash. It was noted that a fuller response was awaited.

Action: Assistant Clerk

167.5 Fish and Chip Shop

KB informed the meeting that the time limit for an appeal expires at the end of the month.

167.6 Flat Above 96 Station Road

It was noted that an appeal had been lodged at the European Court of Human Rights.

167.7 Puddleducks

KB informed the meeting that the time limit for an appeal expires early February 2019.

P168/18 SDNPA Planning Applications Received for Consultation

168.1 **18/03716/FUL – 5-6 Lower Mead – New Plant Equipment to Replace Existing**

The Chairman noted that the time for making submissions had expired but that LPC had already made submissions without objecting to the works and noted that the APC had resubmitted the same comments in respect of the amended application.

168.2 **18/05660/LIS – Burgates Lodge – Listed Building Consent – New porch and hard standing**

The Chairman reminded the meeting that the planning application for these works was considered at last month's meeting and that this application was a listed building application and therefore the only grounds on which objections could be based had to relate to the character of the building and its surroundings for which it was listed.

The Chairman noted that two members of the public wished to speak. Following unanimous agreement the meeting was adjourned at 19.47.

The first member of the public (who lives in the agricultural complex) informed the meeting that he had objected to the application on the basis that this was an urbanisation of an agricultural complex which has its roots in the late 17th century. He informed the meeting that there were no details on the hard standing and so it was impossible to know what it would look like and that in any event to lose the green verge would have a high visual impact. He further informed the meeting that the addition of a porch would destroy the current pretty street scene.

The second member of the public (who lives in the agricultural complex) informed the meeting that he had two concerns with the proposed works the first being the visual amenity issue and the second is the sightline issue. He expressed concern that there was very little detail of the proposed materials and so difficult to assess exactly what it will look like but that cars parking on the verge would have a detrimental effect on the street scene and would obscure the sightlines for those exiting the adjoining roads.

The first member of the public informed the meeting that the parking spaces would be available for all sorts of vehicles, not just nice, clean, new cars. He expressed concern that commercial vehicles could be parked there.

The meeting reconvened at 20.05.

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD STRONGLY OBJECT** to the planning application. The property is a listed building in an agricultural landscape with a pretty and aesthetically pleasing street scene and to permit the application would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and the property itself for the following reasons:-

Grass Verge

1. the removal of the green verge and its replacement with unspecified hard standing

would have a dramatic and detrimental effect on the street scene. The green verge is a pleasant part of the street scene and is highly visible on both approaches to the property on Farnham Road. The replacement of the verge with unspecified hardstanding would be an urbanisation of an agricultural complex and would have a detrimental effect on the visual impact of the landscape and the character of the listed building.

2. the intention (if the application is granted) is that at least two vehicles will be parked on the area which is currently a green verge. The parking of vehicles on the verge would have a detrimental effect on the street scene and the visual amenity of the area.
3. in addition the parking of vehicles in front of the listed property would have further detrimental effect on the street scene by obscuring the visual amenity of a pretty listed building in an agricultural setting.
4. the grass verge is, of itself, an important part of the rural landscape as it accentuates the rural setting of the listing building.
5. Policy Liss 10 of the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan (“LNDP”) provides that “proposals for development within the setting of buildings on the statutory list must not harm their character and distinctiveness”. The removal of the grass verge, the laying of hardstanding, the parking of vehicles in front of the listed building all harm the character of the listed building, its distinctiveness and the rural setting and street scene within which it is situated.

Porch

1. the property is a listed building and under Policy Liss 10 of the LNDP proposals for development “must not harm their character and distinctiveness”. The construction of a porch would completely change the character of the building and would have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the property.
2. the property’s orientation in the landscape is such that the part of the property fronting Farnham Road is the back wall of the property. There is a serviceable front door on the front of the property which faces into the agricultural complex. The construction of a porch and doorway would change the building’s orientation in the landscape and within the agricultural complex of which it forms part. This would have a detrimental effect on the visual aesthetic of the agricultural complex.
3. the construction of a porch will have a detrimental effect on the visual aesthetic of the street scene.

Lastly LPC is concerned that the planning application relating to these works (Planning application number 18/04705/HOUS) and this listed building application have not been dealt with together by EHDC. LPC considered the planning application and submitted comments on that application without being aware that the property was a listed building. It should be noted in any planning application whether or not the property is a listed building. LPC may have made very different submissions in response to the planning application (18/04705/HOUS) if it had been aware that the property was a listed building.

LPC understands that due to different land ownership of the access the proposed dropped kerb may not be achievable. It is important that the possible implications of this are carefully considered.

168.3 18/05477/HOUS – 92A Station Road – Porch to front
Having discussed the application, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.

168.4 18/06081/HOUS – Hangery – Two storey side extension and first floor balcony, rear lean-to extension to front, first floor extension over existing balcony, first floor extension over existing garage, demolition of existing store, conversion of existing garage into residential accommodation and construction of new double garage

Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application PROVIDED THAT:-

- a) the proposed development when added to the previous development does not exceed the 50% rule in Policy H16
- b) the planning permission contains a condition that the new garage is not to be used as residential accommodation, is not to be used other than as a garage, is to be used ancillary to the main dwelling and will not be used as a separate residential dwelling.

168.5 **18/06106/HOUS – 14 Berrylands – Two storey side extension and change of existing tile hanging to horizontal cladding and smooth render**

Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application PROVIDED THAT:-

- a) the planning officer can assure LPC that there will be no detrimental affect to the enjoyment and visual amenity of 13 Berrylands
- b) the planning officer can assure LPC that the proposed 3 parking spaces indicated on the block plan submitted with the application are actually achievable.

Councillor Mayo left the meeting at this point.

P169/18 SDNPA Applications Approved

It was noted that the following applications were approved

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/01167/HOUS	The Old Rectory, Farnham Lane, Liss	Conversion of outbuilding to holiday let

P170/18 SDNPA Applications Refused: None

P171/18 SDNPA Applications Appeals:

It was noted that the following application was appealed

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
17/05144/HOUS	13 Dennis Way	Retention of wooden shed to front of house

P172/18 SDNPA Applications Withdrawn: None

P173/18 TPO Applications – Referred to the Tree Warden:

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

18/06100/TPO	Old London, Rake Road, Liss	Yes Tree (P) – crown lift to 5m and crown reduction to leave height of 6/7m and spread of 4m.
--------------	--------------------------------	--

RESOLVED: LPC WOULD NOT OBJECT to these works

P174/18 TPO Applications Approved:

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

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/04772/TPO	Vine Cottage, 1 East Hill Drive	T7 and T8 Beech – crown reduction

P175/18 TPO Made: None

P176/18 Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan Monitoring

176.1 Following discussion it was agreed that it would be best now to wait until January before moving this forward and it was noted that there were two strands to the monitoring:-

- a) the monitoring of sites as they come forward – eg. Andlers Ash etc
- b) the consideration of individual applications to note whether they comply with the LNDP

176.2 The Chairman informed the meeting that Cllr Hargreaves would arrange a meeting with

SDNPA to discuss the best way of monitoring especially in conjunction with the monitoring of the SDNPA Plan which should be finalised in spring 2019.

P177/18 Any Other Business

177.1 SDNPA Plan

It was noted that the Inspector had now finished his examination of the proposed plan and it was anticipated that he would report back in March or April 2019.

177.2 Mint Road Development Site

Cllr Wright informed the meeting that the owner had carried out various works to the street including the placing of gabions in the river to rebuild the bank. She informed the meeting that Liss Forest Residents Association were trying to establish whether planning permission is required for the gabions and that EHDC were contacting HCC and the Environment Agency to look at this.

177.3 Other Applications

- a) The APC informed the meeting that the application for the Grange had been refused and read out the reasons for refusal.
- b) The APC informed the meeting that the application for 11 Pine Walk had been approved.
- c) The APC informed the meeting that the application relating to Mendip Cottage had been withdrawn.
- d) The Chairman informed the meeting that a new application had been made in respect of Ponticum which the committee had previously considered. She reminded the meeting that the previous application had been refused. She informed the meeting that the new application would be considered at the committee meeting in January and suggested that committee members carry out a site visit prior to the meeting in January.

There being no other business, the Chairman then closed the meeting.

The meeting was closed at 8.45 pm.

.....
Chairman

Next Meeting: 14 January 2019 at 7.30pm