



LISS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held at 19.30 hrs on 11 February 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.

P15/19 Apologies: Apologies were received from Cllrs Hargreaves and Jerrard.

P16/19 Declarations of interests: Cllr Budden advised that as a member of the EHDC Planning Committee he would refrain from any vote required.

P17/19 Approval of Minutes of the Meeting on 14 January 2019

Resolved: The minutes of the meeting of 14 January 2019 be approved as a correct record. Proposed by Cllr McDonald and seconded by Cllr Mayo and a unanimous vote.

P18/19 Matters Arising from Minutes of Meeting on 14 January 2019

18.1 04.2 – Mint Road

Cllr Wright informed the meeting that she had been advised that gabions were now being put along the other side of the river and requested that the APC chase this up again with EHDC.

Action: APC

18.2 04.3 – Shed, St Mary Road

Cllr McDonald asked whether any further action was required. Cllr Budden informed the meeting that no planning permission was required for the shed because it was under a certain size.

18.3 04.4 – Highways Responses to Planning Applications

The APC informed the meeting that she had chased CCllr Oppenheimer and was awaiting a response.

Action: APC

18.4 14.3/R19 – Warren Road

Cllr Wright informed the meeting that EHDC had been to inspect and had suggested to the occupier that they go to EHDC offices to make a planning application.

18.5 Cumbers – Oak framed garage and store – SDNP/18/03873/HOUS

The Chairman confirmed that a response had been submitted in line with the comments made by the various committee members by email and as previously approved by the Chairman

18.6 92A Station Road – Porch to front and conversion of loft space – SDNP/18/05477/HOUS

The Chairman confirmed that a response had been submitted in line with the comments made by the various committee members by email and as previously approved by the Chairman.

18.7 Puddleducks, Station Road

The APC informed the meeting that although no official appeal had yet been made, an email had been received from the owner of Puddleducks advising that it was their intention to appeal the refusal to grant planning permission.

18.8 Fish and Chip Shop, Station Road

Cllr Budden informed the meeting that an inspection would be carried out to decide whether or not the property had been reinstated for both planning and building regulations.

Following further discussion it was resolved that the APC should write to the owners informing them that LPC is pleased to see that the property has been reinstated but is concerned that the signage above the shop is not yet in keeping with the Conservation Area guidance on shop signs and asking them to replace it with a more appropriate sign noting that

LPC is keen to improve the quality of the village centre as it is a conservation area. It was further agreed that a copy of the letter should be sent to EHDC. **Action: APC / Chairman**

P19/19 Planning Applications Received for Consultation

- 19.1 **35158/023 – Symondstone Farm, Wishander Lane, Churt – Lawful development certificate proposed – use of land for siting of caravans**
Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION** nor make any comment as the property is not within Liss Parish nor adjoining it.
- 19.2 **19/00211/HOUS – 11 Dennis Way – Retention of small timber framed and timber clad motorcycle shelter sited in front of the property**
Having discussed the application, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION.**
- 19.3 **19/00101/HOUS – The Owl House, Limes Close, GU33 7DR – replacement conservatory following demolition of existing conservatory**
Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION**
- 19.4 **19/00107/HOUS – Crouch Readons – Single and two storey rear extension**
Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD STRONGLY OBJECT** to the planning application and express its disappointment that the application is in respect of an extension which is clearly in breach of the 50% rule set out in policy H16 and so should not be approved by the Planning Authority.
- 19.5 **18/06106/HOUS – 14 Berrylands, GU33 7DB – Two storey front extension and change of existing tile hanging to horizontal cladding and smooth render**
It was noted that the amendment to the application was to the description only and that there had been no changes to the plans or other documents. This being the case, it was resolved that there were no further comments to be made to those already submitted.
- 19.6 **19/00300/HOUS – 18 Andlers Ash Road. GU33 7LL – First floor extension to change the existing two-bedroom detached bungalow into a four bedroom house**
Following discussion, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD STRONGLY OBJECT** to the planning application for the following reasons:-
a) there is a shortage of bungalow style properties within the village and the loss of another one would further erode the mix of properties types within the village
b) the extension would have a visual impact and will be detrimental to the visual aesthetic on the edge of the village settlement as the increased height will be noticeable in the landscape contrary to policy LISS 4 of the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan.
c) the extension is at first floor which is contrary to policy 5.7 of the adopted Village Design Statement which provides that “Development...on the edge of the settlement should be low rise so it does not impinge on the wider landscape”. LPC notes that a proposed extension to the doctors’ surgery on Hill Brow Road was refused on this basis.
d) the proposed extension is an overdevelopment for the size of the plot
e) 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.
- 19.7 **19/00388/HOUS – Bennath, Mill Road, GU33 7BE – Front porch following demolition of existing porch**
Having discussed the application, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.

19.8 **19/00334/FUL – 71A Station Road GU33 7AD – Retrospective change of use from office to 1 bed residential flat**

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

- a) the change of use results in the property being reclassified as “more vulnerable” under the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) as a result of the increase in the vulnerability of the site to flooding post development. The NPPF sets out a minimum standard for new residential floor levels which cannot be achieved with this development as it is not possible to raise the existing floor level within the property
- b) the site requires a flood warning and evacuation plan post development and “flood restraint design measures” and planning permission should not be granted until such plan and measures have been put in place.
- c) the property is adjacent to commercial premises which are currently being used as a “graphic designers” which includes the use of noisy printers and other equipment. LPC is concerned to ensure that the property has adequate sound-proofing for the amenity of the occupiers.
- d) the property does not have the benefit of off-street parking and there is a shortage of on-street parking on Station Road
- e) the property is very small and undersized in comparison with similar properties within the village centre conservation area
- f) lastly LPC is very concerned that the applicant, who is a very experienced property developer who has developed properties within the area over a long period of time, did not obtain planning permission prior to carrying out these works as he would have been fully aware that planning permission would have been required. LPC is concerned that the applicant believes he has a better chance of a retrospective application succeeding where a pre-development application would not have been successful.

19.9 **19/00503/HOUS – White Stones Hill Brow Road GU33 7LQ – Detached garage with room over and external staircase**

Having discussed the application, **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application but request the following conditions:-

- a) the use of the detached garage with room over should be restricted to those purposes only and not for residential purposes
- b) the use of the detached garage with room over is ancillary to the use and occupation of the residential dwelling house known as White Stones, Hill Brow Road, GU33 7LQ; and
- c) that no future residential use be permitted.

P20/19 SDNPA Applications Approved

It was noted that the following applications were approved:-

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/05624/HOUS	Old Berry Grove Farm, Farnham Road, GU33 6JZ	Retention of paving, granite sets, sleeper walls on each side and wooden bin all at the entrance of the property
18/05626/HOUS	Old Berry Grove Farm, Farnham Road, GU33 6JZ	Retention of three gazebos
18/05098/FUL	Drovers Lodge, Hill Brow Road, GU33 7QD	Single storey extension to existing bungalow, replacement of existing external board cladding and concrete roof tiles. Glazed open veranda to part of front and rear elevation

P21/19 SDNPA Applications Refused: None

P22/19 SDNPA Applications Appeals: None

P23/19 SDNPA Applications Withdrawn:

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

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
--------------------	----------------	--------------------

18/04705/HOUS	Burgates Lodge, Farnham Road, GU33 6JZ	New porch and hard standing for parking area with dropped kerb
18/05660/LIS	Burgates Lodge, Farnham Road, GU33 6JZ	Listed Building Consent – new porch and hard standing for parking area with dropped kerb

P24/19 TPO Applications – Referred to the Tree Warden:

24.1 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.

19/00089/TCA	St Peters Church, Church Street GU33 6JY Beech Place, Western Road, Liss, GU33 7AG	T1 Yew – reduce crown, reduce height, reduce north, south and west aspects, T2 Sequoia – ivy trimming, T3 and T4 Norway Maple – fell
--------------	---	--

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

24.2 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.

19/00122/TPO	5 Pine Walk, GU33 7AT	Oak Tree - Remove three lower branches, reduce branches by 2-3m leaving finished length of 6m
--------------	-----------------------	--

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

24.3 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.

19/00323/TPO	Bishearne House, Farnham Road, GU33 6JE	Oak Tree – Limb B1 cut back to main trunk, Limb B2 reduce by 2m and thinned, Limb B3 reduced by 3m together with judicious thinning, Limb B4 reduced by 2.5- 3m and Limb B5 reduced by 2m
--------------	--	--

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

24.4 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.

19/00499/TPO	82 Newfield Road, Liss, GU33 7BW	T1 Oak (T2 Oak TPO) - Selectively reduce various boughs that are overhanging the boundary of 82 Newfield Road. The finished spread will be 9 metres and no height will be touched. All finishing cuts will be to suitable growth points. One lowest bough will be removed back to trunk
--------------	-------------------------------------	---

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

P25/19 TPO Applications Approved:

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/05867/TPO	25 Pine Walk, GU33 7AT	Red Oak in front – crown reduce by no more than 2-2.5m
18/05866/TPO	18 Upper Mount, GU33 7RE	T1 Oak – crown reduction leaving height of 12m, crown spread of 3.5m (west), 3.5m (north), 3m (east) and 4m (south)
18/06100/TPO	Old London, Rake Road, GU33 7HB	Yew Tree – crown lift to 5m, crown reduction to leave height of no less than 6/7m and spread of 4m

P26/19 TPO Made: None

P27/19 Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan Monitoring

27.1 The Chairman informed the meeting that she had received a response from SDNPA regarding their current position regarding monitoring. It was noted that there had been a change of staff at SDNPA and that SDNPA was intending to respond more fully when the new member of staff was in post. This being the case it was noted that there was nothing more to be done at this stage.

P28/19 Any Other Business

28.1 South Downs Local Plan Examination

It was noted that LPC were only required to comment on the soundness and legal compliance

of the proposed modifications. the only concern expressed was for greater clarification regarding the number of gypsy and traveller sites.

28.2 EHDC – Local Plan Consultation

Cllr Budden informed the meeting that EHDC were hoping for positive feedback as it had been actively involving local parishes etc in the process. Following discussion it was agreed that a response should be sent stating that LPC welcomed the stronger policies concerning the countryside protection including measures for mitigation and long-term management.

Action: APC

28.3 White Eagle Lodge

The Chairman informed the meeting that four Councillors had attended the public consultation and that her only concern was the impact the development might have on the Dark Skies policy but that the committee could not determine anything until the application comes to the Planning Committee for proper consideration.

28.4 Oak Tree by Spread Eagle Pub

The APC informed the meeting of the contents of the email received from EHDC’s arboriculturalist. Following discussion the APC was instructed to respond again to the arboriculturalist (copying in CC Russell Oppenheimer) stating that the ownership and current management of the tree was irrelevant when deciding or not the tree is of sufficient importance to merit protection and that it is an important principle that if a tree is of sufficient importance then it should have the benefit of a TPO. The tree is historically important for the reason previously given and is known as the Stocks or Taro Oak.

Action: APC

28.5 CPRE Meeting

Cllr Wright advised the meeting on the discussions at the CPRE meeting on 8th February 2019 which included the Housing Minister’s address on a planning system that permits “more, better, faster” and his comments on the value of local plans and the problems with Permitted Development rights.

Cllr Wright also informed the meeting that there had been a consultation on Permitted Development rights to which CPRE had responded and which were now closed. She informed the meeting that she had not been aware of this consultation and the Chairman informed the meeting that she had not seen this consultation either.

28.6 Heath Mount

Cllr Mayo noted that there may be a government policy to ensure a “better spread” of migrants to reduce the current concentrations of migrants in cities and move some into more rural areas. Cllr Budden informed the meeting that he would check the latest position on Heath Mount.

Action: Cllr Budden

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

The meeting was closed at 9pm.

.....
Chairman

Next Meeting: 11 March 2019 at 7.30pm