



LISS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held at 19.30hrs on 14 January 2019.

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.

P01/19 Apologies: Apologies were received from Cllrs Hargreaves and Jerrard.

P02/19 Declarations of interests: Cllr Budden advised that as a member of the EHDC Planning Committee he would refrain from any vote required.

P03/19 Approval of Minutes of the Meeting on 19 December 2018

Resolved: The minutes of the meeting of 19 December 2018 be approved as a correct record. Proposed by Cllr Linsley and seconded by Cllr Wright and a unanimous vote.

P04/19 Matters Arising from Minutes of Meeting on 19 December 2018

04.1 Fish and Chip Shop, Station Road

Cllr Linsley informed the meeting that building works were underway. He informed the meeting that the brick wall had been replaced with breeze blocks, wooden sills and vertical posts had been put in and the door had been replaced. He informed the meeting that the illuminated sign was still in place. He informed the meeting that he had contacted EHDC and left a message for the officer dealing with the case.

Cllr Budden confirmed that the owners had until 26 January to either reinstate the property or appeal and that if nothing was done by 26 January an enforcement notice would be served.

Cllr McDonald informed the meeting that the batons did not look as substantial as the original ones and Cllr Linsley agreed.

Cllr Linsley suggested that all members of the committee look at the property to check what has been done. He informed the meeting that the door has been set back again but that the concrete had not been cleared from the gutter.

04.2 Mint Road Development Site

The Chairman informed the meeting that the planning appeal had been dismissed for various reasons including that it was outside the settlement boundary and was not necessary as there was the extant permission for one dwelling. It was noted that this decision provided good support for the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.40pm to receive an update from Mrs Eileen Adams.

Mrs Adams informed the meeting that LFRA had heard nothing further on the matter of the gabions which had been installed on the site and were altering the river course. She informed the meeting that EHDC had referred the matter to HCC as the lead local flood river authority. She informed the meeting that there should have been an application for consent to the works and no application had been made. She further informed the meeting that she had spoken to John Holmes at EHDC who had raised the matter with the Building Regs department which had not been aware of the situation but had referred it to HCC.

The meeting was reconvened at 7.45pm

Following discussion the APC was instructed to refer the matter to HCC and liaise with John Holmes
Action: Assistant Clerk

04.3 Cllr McDonald raised the matter of the shed that had been constructed without permission at 7 St Marys Road and asked if any progress had been made. Cllr Budden confirmed that he would chase this up with the planning officer.
Action: Cllr Budden

04.4 Cllr Wright asked if a further response had been received from Russell Oppenheimer regarding the lack of a response from HCC Highways to planning applications. The APC informed the meeting that no further response had been received and that she would chase this up.
Action: Assistant Clerk

P05/19 Planning Applications Received for Consultation

05.1 **18/06449/FUL – Cherry Croft, Hill Brow – Conversion and enlargement of habitable outbuilding into a two bedroom dwelling**

The Chairman briefly set out the planning application details and the it was agreed that the meeting be adjourned to enable public comments to be heard.

Meeting adjourned at 7.50pm

Mr Peter Wykeham-Martin, of Corner Cottage which neighbours Cherry Croft, informed the meeting that he wished to object to the planning application for the following reasons:-

- a) the application is misleading and inaccurate as the proposed development is not a conversion of a habitable property but the erection/construction of a new building
- b) the CIL Additional Information Form is also misleading as it refers to the development as a two bed bungalow of less than 100 square metres which is not a new dwelling but a conversion. All of these were untrue as the property was a two storey house of over 100 square metres and was a new build
- c) the development site is outside the settlement boundary and it did not fall into one of the exemptions as it was not required for rural purposes
- d) the new property will have a height approximately 4.5m higher than the existing building. The proposed development will overlook the surrounding properties and those properties will have a loss of privacy.
- e) the new property would be visible in the landscape and, in particular, from Stodham Lane
- f) the parking provision was insufficient for the two properties. There should be four parking spaces but the plans only show 2.
- g) the outbuilding in its present state does not have the benefit of any main services and so is not a habitable dwelling.

Cllr Linsley asked if the outbuilding had ever been lived in. Mr Wykeham-Martin informed the meeting that he had lived next door for 30 years and that when he had first moved in the outbuilding was still used by the Water Board but had never been used for residential purposes.

The Chairman asked the other member of the public if he had any further comments to make.

Mr Turpin informed the meeting that he lived in the cottage further down Stodham Lane, just below Cherry Cottage. He confirmed that he agreed with all the points that Mr Wykeham-Martin had made but wanted to make two comments:-

- a) the new house would interrupt their view and they would suffer a loss of amenity and a loss of privacy as their property was lower down and would be very overlooked
- b) the property and outbuilding are on a dangerous corner and so additional car movements in and out of the site or the parking of additional cars on the roads was dangerous.

There being no further questions, the meeting was reconvened at 8pm

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION** for the following reasons:-

- a) the planning application refers to the “conversion and enlargement of a habitable outbuilding”. The outbuilding is a redundant water pumping station, is not fit for habitation and does not have the benefit of services such as electricity, heating, water and drainage. As such it is not a habitable dwelling and should not be considered as such when the application is being considered by the planning officer
- b) as the outbuilding is not a habitable outbuilding and in view of the level of works proposed to convert the existing outbuilding, the proposed development is not the conversion of a habitable outbuilding into a dwelling but the construction of a new dwelling. The site lies outside of a defined settlement policy boundary. The spatial strategy of the East Hampshire District Joint Core Strategy (“JCS”), the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan (“LNDP”) and the South Downs Local Plan (“Local Plan with informal draft track changes November 2018 version” (“SDLP”) directs development to areas within defined settlement policy boundaries in order to direct development to the most sustainable locations and to protect the countryside. No justification has been put forward for an exceptional need for the location. The proposal is not justified and would result in unsustainable development outside of established settlement policy boundaries. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CP1, CP2, CP10 and CP19 of the JCS, policy LISS 1 of the LNDP and policies SD1, SD4, SD6 and SD25 of the SDLP and the advice contained in the NPPF.
- c) The site is small and the layout of the proposed development would result in a cramped site and would be an overdevelopment of the site.
- d) The proposed development is referred to in the documents as a two-bed bungalow, when it is clear that it is a two-storey house. The roof height of the proposed house will be at least 4.5m higher than the existing height of the outbuilding. This additional height on the outbuilding would result in harm to the visual appearance of the site and the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy LISS 9 of the LNDP, policy CP29 of the JCS, policy SD6 of the SDLP and the advice contained in the NPPF
- e) Further the additional height of the proposed development and the proposed development itself will be highly visible in the rural landscape contrary to policy LISS 4 of the LNDP , policy CP20 of the JCS, and the SDLP including draft policy SD4 on Landscape Character and draft Policy SD6 on Safeguarding Views. These policies all seek to protect and enhance the landscape.
- f) The proposal shows only two car parking spaces for the existing property, Cherry Croft, and the proposed new two-bed dwelling house. This is insufficient and there should be at least 4 car parking spaces on site, two for each of the properties. The proposal is contrary to policy LISS 15, policy CP31 of the JCS and policy SD22 of SDLP.
- g) Further there is insufficient provision of visitors and tradesmen and for deliveries and so on during the construction period contrary to policy LISS 15.
- h) In addition to the lack of parking available on the site, it is imperative that vehicles are able to turn round on the site as the site is on a dangerous corner on Hill Brow Road and vehicles cannot be permitted to reverse onto the highway.
- i) the proposed development of the uninhabitable outbuilding will result in a two storey house. The site is higher than the surrounding properties. Therefore the proposed development will have an adverse and detrimental effect on the nearby properties through loss of amenity and loss of privacy.

05.2 **18/006568/CND – 180 Forest Road** – Variation of condition 1 of planning permission 38505/005 dated 27.01.2010 to vary as follows:- “The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 180 Forest Road.

The Chairman noted that Mrs Adams wished to address the meeting regarding this application. It was agreed that the meeting should be adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 8.05pm.

Mrs Adams informed the meeting that 180 was being used for a car repair business and had been visited by EHDC and that the use had ceased for a short while but had now

recommended. The property was displayed using Google Earth and the use of the property was discussed.

The meeting was reconvened at 8.10pm.

Cllr Mayo informed the meeting that the property was wholly unsuitable for any other use than the existing use. Cllr Wright expressed concern that reference to “residential” may mean it could be slept in which may then lead to an application for a separate residential dwelling. Cllr Wright reminded the meeting that Natural England according to pre-application correspondence from Natural England referred to by the application “would be likely to object to an application of this type on the basis it would be impossible to ensure no future misuse of the property...that may incur an adverse impact on the integrity of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA.

Having discussed the application, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD STRONGLY OBJECT** to the amendment to the planning condition and that the existing condition should be retained without amendment for the following reasons:-

- a) the issues which existed at the time of the original planning application and led to the imposition of the original condition, still exist.
- b) the existing condition on the property restricts the use of the property to a narrowly defined use which can be easily and readily investigated and the effects of which on the integrity of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA (“the SPA”) are known as this is the current use of the property and has been its use since 2010. To vary the condition as per the application would allow the property to be used for any ancillary purpose, which includes a wide range of uses. The effects of such uses on the SPA are unknown and such uses may incur an adverse impact on the integrity of the SPA.
- c) if the variation of the condition were approved and the property were used for an ancillary use that does cause an adverse impact on the integrity of the SPA it would be more difficult to stop that adverse impact on planning grounds

The Parish Council is also concerned that it appears that the property, 180 Forest Road, is being used for business purposes, that is for the repair of motor vehicles.

05.3 **18/06370/LDP – Ponticum, Farther Common Lane – creation of an outbuilding incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house under Class E of the General Permitted Development Order 2015**

The Chairman noted that concern had been expressed by nearby neighbours that the development will not take place, but that the applicant could “stack up” all the square footage gained through the various applications made and then knock down the existing building and construct one building using all the available square footage plus a further 50% in size as Policy H16 could allow

Cllr Wright informed the meeting that in cases judges had been divided on the issue of size and expressed the opinion that LPC should repeat its concern that this is an LDC application for a development which is over-large in relation to the property to which it is ancillary. This should be of particular concern since it lies within the National Park countryside. She expressed the opinion that this was not the proper use of the LDC process. The Chairman agreed with this opinion as to be able to construct such buildings under the LDC process undermines the objectives of the SDNP.

The Chairman asked if the 2013 permission is extant as it is still referred to on one of the drawings and if it was lapsed whether a letter had been sent to the applicant stating this was the case. Cllr Budden confirmed that it has lapsed and confirmed that he would raise the need to issue a formal notice with the planning office.

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE APPLICATION** for the following reasons:-

- a) the proposed development is over-large in proportion to the existing dwelling and, as such, it is not suitable or appropriate for it to be dealt with under the LDC process but should be subject to a planning application. To deal with it under the LDC process undermines the objectives of the SDNP. The proposal should be considered in the

context of the national park.

- b) the proposed development is too large to be described as “incidental” to the main house,
- c) the proposed development will have a detrimental effect and a negative visual impact in the SDNP landscape, contrary to policy LISS 4 of the LNDP, policy CP20 of the JCS, and the SDLP including draft policy SD4 on Landscape Character and draft Policy SD6 on Safeguarding Views. These policies all seek to protect and enhance the landscape.
- d) the proposed materials for the proposed development do not appear to be in keeping with the surrounding properties contrary to policy LISS 9 of the LNDP, policy CP29 of the JCS and policy SD5 of the SDLP. A more sympathetic design might help make the development more compatible with the national park.
- e) The large glazed roof may conflict with SDNPA Dark Night Skies Policy, policy SD8 of the SDLP.

IT WAS ALSO RESOLVED THAT THE APC SHOULD REFER THIS APPLICATION TO THE LINK OFFICER.

05.4 **18/06393/HOUS – 9 Greenfields** – Two storey side extension partially over existing garage, single storey rear extension and new porch
Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.

05.5 **18/06495/HOUS – White Beam, Hatch Lane** – Increase in roof height to facilitate enlargement of first floor living accommodation and rebuilding of existing garages
Having discussed the application, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application but that:-

- a) whilst LPC was glad at the improved parking in the area, the loss of the rural visual aesthetic at that end of Hatch Lane was regretted as the increased height will be noticeable in the landscape contrary to policy LISS 4 of the LNDP
- b) to try to lessen the visual impact of the increased height of the property, LPC requests that a condition to be added that sympathetic landscape screening be planted to try to preserve and maintain the rural feel of the area as required by policy LISS 4 of the LNDP and policy CP20 of the JCS both of which, together with policies SD4 and SD6 of the SDLP, seek to protect and enhance the landscape.

05.6 **19/00003/HOUS – 9 The Oval** – Part single and part two storey extension to rear
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.

05.7 **18/06507/HOUS – The Owl House, Limes Close** – Installation of photovoltaic cells on the SW and SE slopes of the roof following removal of solar thermal equipment from the roof
Having discussed the application, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.

05.8 **18/06516/HOUS – Bryn Gardens, Rake Road** – Detached garage with office space above
Having discussed the application, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application as the additional off-street parking was beneficial to the area but request the following conditions:-

- a) the use of the detached garage with office space above should be restricted to those purposes only and not for residential purposes
- b) the use of the detached garage with office space above should be ancillary to the use and occupation of the residential dwelling house known as 6 Rockpit Cottages; and
- c) that no future residential use be permitted.

P06/19 SDNPA Applications Approved

It was noted that the following applications were approved:-

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/00357/FUL	1 Stable Court, Stodham Park,	Retention of track improvements within Stodham

	GU33 7QX	Copse
18/03687/FUL	Cumbers Studio, 31 Andlers Ash Road, GU33 7LL	Change of use from ancillary residential building to an independent dwelling
18/05229/HOUS	60 Newfield Road, GU33 7BW	Rear conservatory following demolition of rear lean-to
18/05326/LDP	Batts Brook, GU33 6JP	Lawful development certificate proposed – single storey rear extension and loft conversion

P07/19 SDNPA Applications Refused: None

P08/19 SDNPA Applications Appeals: None

P09/19 SDNPA Applications Withdrawn:

It was noted that the following applications had been withdrawn:-

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/5215/HOUS	Mendip Cottage, Flexcombe Lane, GU33 6LH	Change of use of attached barn into habitable accommodation following demolition of existing lean-to
17/06506/FUL	Land north east of Andlers Ash Nursery	Erection of 77 dwellings

P10/19 TPO Applications – Referred to the Tree Warden: None

P11/19 TPO Applications Approved: None

P12/19 TPO Made: None

P13/19 Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan Monitoring

13.1 The Chairman noted that it had previously been agreed that after Christmas and after the inspector's examination on the SDNPA Plan, Chris Paterson should be contacted for a meeting on how best to monitor the LNDP. **ACTION Assistant Clerk/Chairman**

P14/19 Any Other Business

14.1 Tesco

It was noted that the works to Tesco were going ahead and that the temporary shop should be open tomorrow.

14.2 CPRE Meeting

The Chairman informed the meeting that the next meeting of the CPRE is on 8th February 2019 at St Marybourne near Andover. She informed the meeting that she cannot attend and asked if anyone else was attending as she wanted someone to explain the apparent incongruity that large building works can be undertaken under the LDC process but garden sheds need full planning permission. It was noted that LPC is a member of CPRE and the APC was instructed to see if LPC gets a free place at this meeting. **Action: Assistant Clerk**

14.3 Warren Road

Cllr Wright informed the meeting that there were an increasing number of horses in the field on Warren Road. She informed the meeting that according to EHDC there was a limit of 4 horses on the field and she had reported to EHDC that the field currently had 7 horses grazing on it and a shed had been erected without consent. She informed the meeting that the planning department has been informed and will liaise with planning enforcement.

14.4 Tree Felling on Stodham Lane

Cllr Budden informed the meeting that he had been approached by several residents concerned at tree felling along Stodham Lane. He informed the meeting that he managed to get the EHDC Arboricultural Office to carry out a site visit and had confirmed that they were only thinning minor trees and had not touched TPO trees. It was noted that his visit meant that those undertaking work on this site are now aware that EHDC is keeping an eye on it

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

The meeting was closed at 8.50pm.

.....
Chairman

Next Meeting: 11 February 2019 at 7.30pm