



LISS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held at 19.30 hrs on 11 March 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 (“APC”).

16 members of the public and 1 member of the press was present.

P29/19 Apologies: Apologies were received from Cllrs Linsley and Jerrard.

P30/19 Declarations of interests: Cllr Budden advised that as a member of the EHDC Planning Committee he would refrain from any vote required on all applications other than the one relating to Cala Homes which is with the SDNPA.

P31/19 Approval of Minutes of the Meeting on 11 February 2019

Resolved: The minutes of the meeting of 11 February 2019 be approved as a correct record. Proposed by Cllr Mayo and seconded by Cllr Wright and a unanimous vote.

P32/19 Matters Arising from Minutes of Meeting on 11 February 2019

32.1 04.1 – HCC Highways Responses

The Chairman read out the response received from County Councillor Russell Oppenheimer and noted that if LPC wished Highways to consider particular planning applications it should refer them.

32.2 04.2 – Heatherbrae, St Patrick’s Lane

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.

32.3 04.3 – White Stones, Hill Brow Road

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

32.4 04.4 – Oak Tree at the Spread Eagle Pub – TPO Request

The Chairman informed the meeting of the response received from the Arboriculturalist. Following discussions the APC was instructed to respond to the Arboriculturalist that the contents of her response were noted and that at present LPC was looking at other options regarding the protection of the tree. It was further resolved that Cllr Budden would speak to the Heritage Officer at EHDC to see if they could assist with gaining protection for the tree.

32.5 P18.1/19 – Mint Road

The APC confirmed that this had been chased with EHDC who were aware that the works were being undertaken and informed the meeting that she was not aware of what action if EHDC had taken. The APC was instructed to chase this up.

32.6 P18.8/19 – Fish and Chip Shop

The APC confirmed that the letter had not yet been sent to the owners.

32.7 P28.2/19 – EHDC Local Plan Consultation

The APC confirmed that the comments had not yet been submitted as it had been put down for reconsideration at this evenings meeting and was on the agenda again as AOB.

32.8 P28.6/19 – Heath Mount

Cllr Budden confirmed that he had not received a response yet and confirmed that he would chase this up.

32.9 P18.7/19 - Puddleducks

Cllr Mayo enquired whether there was yet a date for the appeal and Cllr Budden confirmed that no date had been set yet for the appeal.

P33/19 Planning Applications Received for Consultation

33.1 **19/00669/FUL – Land North East of Andlers Ash Nursery – 80 Residential Units etc**

The Chairman introduced the planning application and referred to the various meetings that she and other members of the committee had attended as observers between Cala Homes and the SDNPA design panel. She informed the meeting that there were over 100 documents for this application, all of which had been considered by the committee. She also informed the meeting that the decision on this application would be taken by SDNPA and not by EHDC under the delegated powers.

She further informed the meeting that central to making their decision was reference to the various planning policies including the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan (“LNDP”), the Village Design Statement (“VDS”), the comments made in response to the last application and the reasons given by SDNPA for refusing the application. She further informed the meeting that members of the LNDP Steering Group had also looked at the application.

The Chairman then proposed adjourning the meeting to hear from members of the public.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.50pm. (see Appendix 1 for responses from members of the public.

The meeting was reconvened at 8.27pm

The Chairman suggested using the comments made on the last application as a template as it has useful categories to respond. In principle the application is not good enough yet for LPC to do anything other than mount an objection. This was agreed.

The Chairman expressed the view that the open space solution has some things to recommend it and there was merit in not having the open space behind the one existing house where it would not be visible or accessible. Cllrs Wright and Hargreaves expressed concerns whether it was practicable and usable as play space for children living on the development. The LNDP pressed for a functional, usable space.

1. Highways

Cllr Hargreaves suggested a holding objection until a response is received from HCC Highways. More detail is required on how a safe crossing at the Hill Brow Road end of the footpath will be achieved.

The three pinch points along Andlers Ash Road required consideration by HCC Highways. Cllr Wright expressed the view that it was not clear how those pinch-points are intended to access the footpaths through the development. There is reference to “mown paths” but such paths are not that useful if trying to get to school.

2. Parking

The LNDP states that parking should not be in front of the housing and should be in courtyards or behind. The reality on the plans is that each house has a garage with a tandem space in front and then a space alongside which is in front of the front door. The house frontages will be a sea of parking which is not apparent from the street illustrations and is only shown on drawing PL07. Cllrs noted that the road is narrow so on street parking must be discouraged to ensure good access for emergency vehicles and refuse disposal.

The committee could not identify where the 17 visitor car parking spaces are on the plans. There is a need for a sufficiency of visitor parking to be spread around the site. It was noted that when the previous application was refused the SDNPA Landscape and Design Officer’s consultation response contained the strong recommendation about parking:- “cars parked

directly in front of homes and tandem parking are not acceptable”.
Cllr Budden proposed re-iterating the need for charging points for electric vehicles.

3. Flooding/Drainage

The committee noted the strength of public concern about flooding and drainage and supported District Councillor Kendall’s objection which should be strongly worded given the overwhelming evidence of existing problems for residents in Andlers Ash Road.

Cllrs expressed the need to ensure that SDNPA is aware that the problem is not just on the site but also off the site along Andlers Ash and particularly the other side of Andlers Ash Road. A response needs to come from Southern Water and HCC that is satisfactory and comprehensive and robust.

The issue of the management of the swales and other flood defences needed addressing.

4. Ecology

Cllr McDonald stated that she thought the number of birdboxes was insufficient and it was noted that there could be one in every house. She also stated that she thought there ought to be more access routes for hedgehogs.

Cllr Wright agreed that there should be more positive measures to improve the biodiversity of the site and to encourage wildlife. Cllrs agreed that the SDNPA should be looking for a net gain on wildlife and biodiversity on the site.

5. Construction Traffic

Cllrs agreed the need to re-iterate the strong point that all construction traffic and activity with vehicles and storage must be on-site and off Andlers Ash Road.

6 Routing of Footpath

Cllrs welcomed the provision of the footpath to the school but repeated the need for details of a proper safe crossing on Hill Brow Road.

Questions had been raised concerning the need for a footpath along Andlers Ash Road. Cllr Budden informed the meeting that HCC were not keen on a footpath alone both sides because the road is quite narrow. Cllr Hargreaves added that the LNDP had not identified the need for a footpath because it was important to keep the semi-rural nature of the area. A footpath would reduce the landscaped buffer. There is a disadvantage in having a footpath that would enable people to cross anywhere. The intention is to try and keep crossing Andlers Ash Road to the pinch points.

7. Other Land

Cllrs noted the lack of adequate landscape buffers. The LNDP requires a 10m strip on the South East boundary to separate the development from the open countryside and a buffer on the North East Boundary to provide separation from Cumbers. It was noted that if all the development was contained within the SPB it could be possible for the buffer to be provided outside the SPB.

8. Green Space and Trees

Roger Mullinger has commented that there were species which were not native and natural and not suited to the soil and that Hilliers are probably best placed to advise on what should be planted on the site.

Cllr Hargreaves noted that Cala Homes seem to have a preference for some form of Management Company which would be owned and run by the residents but guarantees are required about the management of the land and the trees and to ensure public access to the open spaces in perpetuity. He stated that a residents’ management company is not the only way to do it and that it was for the planning authority to ensure that there is a very strong condition requiring that adequate arrangements are put in place to preserve and maintain both the landscape and the ecology but also to guarantee the future use and public access to the open space. Cllrs agreed that if what Cala Homes proposed is not adequate the application should be refused.

9. Lighting

Cllrs welcomed the low-level bollard lighting but request a guarantee that there is no additional overhead lighting to ensure compliance with the SDNPA “Dark Night Skies” Policy.

10. Other Utilities

Cllrs agreed that a guarantee should be sought that all services to be underground.

11. Design

Generally:

The committee noted that nobody had spoken positively about the design but words such as drab, depressing, dire and “communist block” had been frequently expressed.

The Chairman of the LDNP Sites Finding Group had submitted the following comments:-

- the number of types and material choice make the overall scheme disjointed and dark which jars against what could be a very playful landscape;
- the detached catslide housing makes the building massing appear larger than it should;
- the design will date badly;
- the amount of black timber and blank roofscapes should be reduced;
- the roof material is key.

Cllrs expressed concern that some of the roofs were orangey/red brick/tile which would not merge easily into the sky. Questions were raised about the use of solar panels on the catslide roofs. Could solar panels be built into the roofs to start with?

The committee considered that the affordable housing is poorly designed and is not well integrated. The flats are badly designed. Units would look better if staggered and the materials are not good enough.

A suggestion was made that the blocks of ‘F’ style houses could be redesigned to create an accessible courtyard of two- bedroomed low-level bungalows to meet the identified local need.

Committee noted the VDS technical supplement has a section on Farmsteads and quotes Hilliers and Cumbers within it and talks about the buildings having roofs, “which generally predominate above the walls and often run down to ground floor level. In most cases the buildings surround a courtyard.” “Materials are traditional and dark, such as dark stained boarding or stone with red brick quoins”. Stone and brick barns exist close to the North and South site boundaries at Cumbers and on the Hillier’s site but there are no such materials proposed on the application. Some of the smaller homes could be hugely improved if they used a different material, such as stone with brick quoins, particularly close to the boundary at Cumbers.

Cllr Hargreaves pointed out that concerns about house types and materials used should be two separate objections. Additional points are:-

- 1 in the LNDP the two sites are shown as distinct and it was never intended to look like one single estate and clearly two separate areas. The design and use of materials are not sufficient to visually separate out the two parts of the site. The LNDP emphasises the trying to achieve two areas of different character on the site. This should be an objection in its own right
2. sustainable design which encompasses a number of things – solar panels, car charging and use of grey water – and there is very little in the application on sustainability and in this day and age there should be a lot more taken on board about sustainable design. Also a separate ground for objection.
3. the development does not meet the community’s needs nor reflect what the LNDP states that the community’s needs are.

Cllr Wright agreed that there needs to be two more distinctive areas.

Flats Over the Garage Area:

Cllrs discussed the design of the flats over the garage area. The height and proximity to Cumbers Studio, which has quite large windows onto the site was noted. Cllr McDonald noted that the glass in the flats' windows is going to be obscured glass. Would eight car parking spaces under two flats be noisy and disturbing for the flat occupiers?

Cllr Hargreaves stated that he thought that a better design solution could be found.

It was agreed that the proposed flats over the garage will have an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of Cumbers.

Housing Mix:

The Chairman expressed concern about the large number of three- and four-bedroom houses and considered the balance across the site to be wrong. The proposed mix does not meet the identified local need. A major concern is that there is insufficient smaller housing. The development needs a larger number of starter homes for first time buyers and also smaller units for the elderly. One and two bed flats are not what people are looking for.

Cala Homes should reconsider the design and mix of all the units and in particular the design of the affordable housing. Smaller units could sit comfortably within the adopted SPB.

General Points

Cllr Hargreaves expressed the view the SPB and number of houses (and flooding/drainage) are the main areas of objection and should be listed first. This was generally agreed.

Cllr Wright stated that she welcomes the 40% affordable housing but the affordable housing should not look like cheap housing or affordable housing.

Cllr Hargreaves expressed the view that there should be a comment that there has been some progress and that there are a number of good points in the application but also a number of areas that need improving.

While it is recognised that there are some positive improvements since the previous application there remain a significant number of reasons for LPC to object to this proposal. Thus, following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION** for the following reasons:-

1. Settlement Policy Boundary

1.1. The proposed development extends beyond the settlement policy boundary for Liss contrary to Policies Liss 1 and Liss 4 and Policy Map (Map 1) of the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan ("LNDP"). The boundary along the Andlers Ash site was drawn using contour lines so as to minimise the impact of the development on views and the landscape in order to meet the requirements of the Liss Landscape Character Assessment (Para 7A33) and the adopted Liss Village Design Statement ("VDS") (Para. 2.6) aimed at preserving the character of the "Hidden Village". Any breach of the boundary would harm the landscape and would set a disastrous precedent for elsewhere in Liss. It would, however, be acceptable if the required 10m native species landscaping/screening on the SE boundary extended outside the Settlement Policy Boundary ("SPB").

2. Proposed number of Units

2.1. The proposed development exceeds the 76 housing units proposed for the site in Policy Liss 8 of the LNDP and in the Key Principles of Development in the Development Brief for Land at Andlers Ash Central and South, as set out in the LNDP.

3. Housing Mix

3.1. The mix of houses does not address the needs of the community as required by the East Hants Joint Core Strategy and contrary to Policy Liss 7, paragraph 3.36 and the Development Brief for Land at Andlers Ash Central and South as set out in the LNDP. The market housing includes too many larger homes and not enough two-bedroom starter homes or smaller,

accessible homes for more elderly residents wishing to “downsize” The quota of affordable flats and houses does not appear to provide sufficient accessible accommodation for the elderly and there are no bungalows.

4. Design and Layout

- 4.1. The expected high-quality housing design is not sufficiently evident, contrary to Policy Liss 9 and the Development Brief for Land at Andlers Ash Central and South of the LNDP and Chapter 6 of the Village Design Statement.
- 4.2. The Andlers Ash Development Brief requires a mix of architectural styles and sizes, predominantly built from differing high quality materials used locally to create a varied residential offering which reflects the approved VDS and the rural setting of the sites. It also requires the two parts of the development to have a different character so that the proposal does not appear to be one large estate.
- 4.3. Paragraph 5.1 of the VDS requires that any development on the edge of settlements should be of such materials and be of a density, bulk, and design that do not detract from the rural setting. Paragraph 6.1 of the VDS seeks the use of traditional and local building materials and detailing and Paragraph 6.3 accepts exceptionally innovative buildings of bold contemporary design may be appropriate providing their design is of high quality and they are fitting to the locality.
- 4.4. There is also a lack of sensitive/appropriate development on the upper (SE) boundary of the proposal site. Sections show that roofs on the upper part of the site will be visible above the 75m contour which the Liss Landscape Assessment, the VDS and the LNDP all seek to protect. Paragraph 5.6 of the VDS requires that development should be of a size and scale that do not dominate any part of the settlements, impinge on their character or their relationship with the countryside. Development on higher ground and on the edge of the settlement should be low rise so it does not impinge on the wider landscape (VDS Para 5.7). The Development Brief for Land at Andlers Ash Central and South in the LNDP asks for “lower units further into the site to limit the visual impact of development”. It also asks for a “strong green boundary strip of around 10m on the SE boundary”. This is not evident.
- 4.5. The proposed style for the market housing appears uninspiring, dark, depressing, and lacking variety. The accentuated roof lines make building massing appear larger than it should. It is unclear how solar panels will look on catslide roofs. There is a real danger that the design will “date” badly. They are not seen to reach the expected SDNP standard.
- 4.6. Designs for the affordable housing are also poor, lack imagination and pay insufficient attention to the adopted VDS. They should be designed to a higher standard and fully integrated into the site. Style ‘F’ plots could be staggered, use a variety of materials and finishes. The ‘F’ units could be - remodelled into a courtyard of two-bedroom low-level bungalows which would address an identified local need, and generally there is lack of bungalows. The Apartment Block is over-long and lacks character.
- 4.7. LPC considers that the flats over the garages are too close to Cumbers Studio (the Development Brief requires a landscape buffer) and are too high and would be too intrusive to the occupiers and owners of Cumbers Studio. There would be a detrimental effect on the amenity of Cumbers Studio. LPC is also concerned at the amenity of the flats above the garages and that the constant movement in 8 car parking spaces will result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance for the occupiers of the flats.

5. Flooding/Drainage

- 5.1. Objection should be maintained until proposals for drainage and the prevention of flooding have been approved by Southern Water and

Hampshire County Council, in order to meet the requirements of Policy Liss 6 and the Development Brief for Land at Andlers Ash Central and South, as set out in the LDNP. Southern Water is responsible for drainage and Hampshire County Council is responsible for drains running through the roads adjoining the sites and for flood management. In view of existing drainage and flooding problems affecting properties on Andlers Ash Road, these bodies need to be satisfied with the ability of the existing drainage infrastructure to cope with the additional demands that will arise as a result of the development. These bodies and the planning authority also need to be satisfied with the arrangements for the future management of the swales and other flood defences on the proposal site, including attenuation tanks and permeable paving.

6. Highways

- 6.1. LPC objects to the proposals until the proposals have been considered and approved by the Highways Authority and it is demonstrated that they fully take account of the requirements of the Access and Landscape, Opens Spaces and Biodiversity sections of the Development Brief for Land at Andlers Ash Central and South in the LNDP.
- 6.2. LPC is concerned at the affect the proposed development will have on vehicles movements on Andlers Ash Road given the nature of the road, the speed of the traffic and the regular on-street parking of cars and commercial vehicles. Solutions must respect the semi-rural character of Andlers Ash Road in accordance with the Development Brief for Land at Andlers Ash Central and South in the LNDP. LPC notes the proposed three pinch-points but urges the SDNPA to request a complete and thorough highways investigation with appropriate and workable traffic management solutions.
- 6.3. LPC is also concerned at the lack of detail relating to the proposed crossing on Hill Brow Road at the end of one of the proposed footpaths and requests that further detail should be required to ensure that there is a safe crossing point on Hill Brow Road for school children.

7. Parking

- 7.1. LPC objects to the quantity of parking in front of the majority of houses, which does not make a positive contribution to the development and its environment, contrary to Policy Liss 15 of the LNDP. This will create a very different street scene from that shown on the submitted drawings. Garages are small and appear insufficient for larger vehicles, with tandem parking in front and the third space directly in front of front doors. Front gardens are tiny. Para. 6.8 of the Village Design Guide asks that all future developments should have reasonable access to off-road parking, which should be located to the rear of the property or suitably hidden within the street scene. It is noted that the SDNPA Landscape and Design Officer Consultation Response to the previous application stated, “cars parked directly in front of homes and tandem parking are not acceptable”.
- 7.2. It is also not clear from the plans where the 17 visitor parking spaces are located. The Andlers Ash Development Brief requires them to be pepper potted throughout the site.
- 7.3. In addition, there is the probability that some on-street parking within the development may not be acceptable given that the roads are narrow and on-street parking would restrict access for refuse collection vehicles and emergency vehicles.
- 7.4. Overall, the number of car parking spaces needs to be increased whilst retaining a pleasant street scene and in such a way that the development does not look like a car park
- 7.5. LPC also notes that there are no charging points for electric vehicles and requests that provision is made.

In addition to its objections LPC has a number of CONCERNS which should be taken into account in agreeing conditions on the application:-

8. Ecology

- 8.1. LPC notes that the landscaping had been greatly improved since the last application. However, LPC believes that more birdboxes and access routes for hedgehogs should be provided as part of the development.
- 8.2. LPC also believes that there should be more positive measures to improve the biodiversity of the site and to encourage wildlife and that the SDNPA should be looking for a net gain on wildlife and biodiversity.

9. Sustainability

- 9.1. There appears to be little attempt in the application to consider sustainability including solar panels, car charging, and use of grey water. The design of the housing should be reconsidered to achieve a more sustainable development.

10. Construction Traffic

- 10.1. Given the previously mentioned issues on Andlers Ash Road, LPC is of the opinion that it is important that all construction traffic, activity with vehicles, parking, unloading and storage must be on-site and no parking should be permitted on Andlers Ash Road.

11. Other Land

- 11.1. LPC believes that there is an inadequate buffer on the South East side of the site along the Settlement Boundary and that this buffer needs to be wider. The LNDP provides for a 10m buffer at this point and a buffer to provide a separation from Cumbers on the North East boundary. The requirements of the LNDP should be respected and followed.

12. Open Space, Green Spaces and Trees

- 12.1. While the realignment of the landscaped open space is generally welcomed and supported there appears to be a disappointing lack of identifiable play space.
- 12.2. LPC is concerned about the future management of the Open Spaces. There is the need for a strong legal agreement to guarantee in perpetuity the retention and management of the Open Spaces which should be dedicated for public use. This issue needs to be resolved before planning is granted and construction commences.
- 12.3. LPC notes that some of the proposed planting was not native species and not suited to the soil type at the site. The planting scheme should be reconsidered to use mainly native species which are suitable for the soil conditions.

13. Lighting

- 13.1. LPC welcomes the proposal for only low-level bollard lighting on the site but would like a condition in the planning permission that there will not be any overhead lighting as well as this will have a negative impact on the SDNPA's "Dark Skies" policy but will also have a negative impact on the existing residents on Andlers Ash Road.

14. Other Utilities

- 14.1. LPC would like confirmation and a planning condition that all utilities to and from the site will be placed underground.

33.2 **19/00322/MPO – St Peter's Church** – Variation of Undertaking 3685/002 relating to change of siting and hours of use of parking

Having discussed the application it was noted that the plan and application did not provide sufficient information for a decision to be made and that the plan submitted was totally inadequate.

The meeting was adjourned at 9.03pm to enable members of the public to make comments on

the application.

Mrs Harvey informed the meeting that she and her husband were the applicants and that they had submitted the planning application after receiving advice from the planning department. She informed the meeting that on the plan the green edged car park is the already existing extension to the cemetery car park which was constructed about 5 years ago. She informed the meeting that applications such as theirs was quite common and that they had approached cemeteries, legal and property departments at EHDC none of which had any objection to the proposed application. She informed the meeting that planning permission was obtained in 2007 which was renewed in 2010. However at that renewal the planning department added a condition that 5 extra parking spaces had to be provided notwithstanding the annex would not increase the capacity at the church. The condition only applies once the annex has been constructed and although works have commenced so that the planning permission is extant there is no intention at present to complete the building of the annex. She informed the meeting that no spaces are allocated in the car park and that no spaces are actually marked in the car park. She informed the meeting that additional information could be provided if required.

The meeting reconvened at 9.13pm.

SH expressed the view that very limited information has been provided in the planning application – the plans are insufficient; the church is not shown/identified and the wording of the original undertaking and the proposed amendment to it are not shown clearly.

SH expressed the view that no objection should be made merely that on the information provided a decision cannot be made and a fuller application should be made.

RH agreed that no objection should be lodged but that the wording of the undertaking and the proposed amendment to it should be included in the application as it is not clear from the application.

AW noted that the undertaking is a unilateral undertaking on the part of the church but that the church is not involved in this application. AW expressing the view that the church should be a party to the application as it is the church (presumably) which gave the original undertaking the applicant is seeking to vary.

Councillor Hargreaves left the meeting at this point.

- 33.3 **19/00668/HOUS – Cardews Coach House, Hill Brow Road** – Conservatory to rear
Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION**
- 33.4 **19/00821/HOUS – Acacia Lodge, 18 Shotterfield Terrace** – Single storey side extension and pitched roof dormers to front and rear roof slope following demolition of existing conservatory
Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.
- 33.5 **19/0 782/FUL – 129 Forest Road** – Retention of Subdivision of the planning unit to create two dwelling
AW informed the meeting that LFRA does not have any view on the application but that one point arising is that of parking and the availability of parking on-site as on-street parking would worsen the already poor parking situation in Forest Road.
Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the application but should express concern at the lack of parking available on-site/off-road.

P34/19 SDNPA Applications Approved

It was noted that the following applications were approved:-

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/03873/HOUS	Cumbers, 31 Andlers Ash Road, GU33 7LL	Oak framed garage and store
18/06393/HOUS	9 Greenfields, GU33 7EH	Two storey side extension partially over existing garage, single storey rear extension and additional new porch
18/05477/HOUS	92A Station Road, GU33 7AD	Porch to front and conversion of existing loft space into habitable accommodation
18/06370/LDP	Ponticum, Farther Common Lane, GU33 7QQ	Lawful Development Certificate – creation of an outbuilding incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house under Class E of the General Permitted Development Order 2015
19/00003/HOUS	9 The Oval, GU33 7AY	Part single, part two storey extension to year
18/06106/HOUS	14 Berrylands, GU33 7DB	Two storey front extension and change of existing tile hanging to horizontal cladding and smooth render

Councillor Wright asked if there had been any response to our concern about the use of LDCs to get round planning restrictions. The Chairman informed the meeting that this issue was on the agenda for a meeting with Tim Slaney at SDNPA at the end of the month.

P35/19 SDNPA Applications Refused: None

P36/19 SDNPA Applications Appeals: None

P37/19 SDNPA Applications Withdrawn:

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

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/06449/FUL	Cherry Croft, Hill Brow Road, GU33 7PS	Conversion and enlargement of habitable outbuilding into a two bedroom dwelling

P38/19 TPO Applications – Referred to the Tree Warden:

38.1 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.

19/00412/TPO	Greywalls House, London Road, Liss, GU33 7QR	Portuguese Laurel (T1) – fell, Sweet Chestnut (T2) – pollard to 7m, Sweet Chestnut (T3, T4, T5 and T6) – pollard to 6m, Sweet Chestnut(T7) – fell.
--------------	--	--

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

38.2 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.

19/00931/TPO	7 Bishearne Gardens, GU33 7SB	T3 Oak – Remove damaged limb back to trunk. Crown lift to 6m. Remove deadwood over 25mm. Crown thin between 20 – 25%
--------------	-------------------------------	--

Resolved: Liss Parish Council would object to the proposed crown thinning as it is not required and could be detrimental to the tree's long term vitality.

P39/19 TPO Applications Approved:

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
19/00089/TCA	St Peter's Church, Church Street, GU33 6JY	T1 Yew – reduce crown, reduce height, reduce north, south and west aspects, T2 Sequoia – ivy trimming, T3 and T4 Norway Maple – fell

P40/19 TPO Made:

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
TCP/19/004835	Land adjacent to Longwood East, London	A1 – Trees Specified by Reference to an Area – area mainly consisting of Oak, Beech, Birch, Cherry

	Road, Hill Brow, West Sussex	Laurel, Cherry, Holly and Fir
SDNP/28154/TP1	Mells House, Farnham Road, Liss, GU33 6JQ	G1 – Group of Trees – Red Oak, Sweet Chestnut, Robinia, Silver Birch, Walnut

P41/19 Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan Monitoring

41.1 It was noted that there was nothing more to be done on this until the SDNPA had appointed a new officer.

P42/19 Any Other Business

42.1 EHDC – Local Plan Consultation

Following discussion earlier in the meeting the APC was instructed to submit the comments made at the previous meeting. **Action Point: APC**

42.2 Other Planning Applications

The APC informed the meeting of the other applications which had been approved and refused since the agenda was published last Wednesday. The applications are:-

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Decision</u>
18/05426/HOUS	Greywalls House, London Road, GU33 7QR	Demolition of existing outbuilding and attached lean-to stores and construction of replacement outbuilding	Approved
18/06106/HOUS	14 Berrylands, GU33 7DB	Two storey front extension and change of existing tile hanging to horizontal cladding and smooth render	Approved
18/06507/HOUS	The Owl House, Limes Close, GU33 7DR	Installation of photovoltaic cells on SW (side) and SE (front) slopes of roof following removal of solar thermal equipment from roof.	Approved
18/06516/HOUS	Bryn Gardens, Rake Road, GU33 7HB	Detached garage with office space above.	Approved
18/06568/CND	180 Forest Road, GU33 7BX	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.	Refused.

It was noted the Planning Permission for Bryn Gardens includes a condition relating to 6 Rockpit Cottages when it should refer to Bryn Gardens. The APC was instructed to raise this with EHDC.

Action Point: APC

42.3 71a Station Road

Councillor McDonald asked if there was anything further to report on 71a Station Road and the Chairman informed the meeting that there was nothing yet.

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

The meeting was closed at 9.20 pm.

.....
Chairman

Next Meeting: 8 April 2019 at 7.30pm

APPENDIX

Comments made by members of the public on application 19/00669/FUL – Land North East of Andlers Ash Nursery

John Dunt who chaired the LNDP Steering Group for three years. Two broad points:-

1. the LNDP was very carefully drawn up, scrutinised and subject to consultation and an independent examination and public hearing and was adopted in full by the National Park and so it should be adhered to
2. Cala Homes have done a considerable amount of work, much of which is commendable but their application does not adhere to the policies in the LNDP in full. The Andlers Ash Development is the largest single development that will be proposed in Liss and it must be right for future generations.

The principle shortcomings are:-

1. the SPB is breached – it must not be
2. the plan is for 80 homes but this should not be for more than 76 as in the LNDP.
3. Parking provision off road within the development is terribly cramped and too limited and this needs to be improved otherwise cars will be parked all along the roads within the development and will hinder not only refuse disposal vehicles but emergency vehicles as well. This element must be approved.
4. the main elevations are largely uninspiring – they are too drab and dark. A lighter approach could be taken at no extra cost.
5. too few smaller units particularly 2 and 1 bed units especially for first time buyers or residents in Liss wishing to downsize. The balance needs to be changed from the larger four bedroom market house to smaller units for the benefit of the people of Liss.

Mike Kendall, District Councillor and Chair of the Flood Action Group, expressed concern at the surface water run-off. The existing drainage system in the Andlers Ash highway is inadequate to deal with surface water run off at present and the measure proposed will not do anything other than exacerbate an existing problem. He stated that he had the names and addresses of residents with whom he had been involved over the last couple of years dealing with problems arising from existing infrastructure problems. A difficult planning issue because the problem arise outside the application site. HCC in addition to dealing with transport issues is also the highways authority and as such is responsible for highway drainage problem. It is also the Local Lead Flood Authority and so should be concerned about the surface water runoff in volumes into the River Rother. LPC should object to this application and not simply make observations, unless and until it sees comments from both Southern Water and HCC about the adequacy of the provisions such as the dry swales, the attenuation tank and the permeable paving to deal with the surface water runoff which will arise from the development.

John Starling, “interested observer”, informed the meeting that he backed up the comments of Mike Kendall and had looked at the technical report by Southern Testing Laboratories which is on the online portal. There is a water table under the site – 1.65m on average. Each of the trees on the site are taking out between 10,000 and 20,000 litres of water a year, the water table will rise. There is no figure given for the disposal of surface water from the site even though there is a flood risk assessment. They are intending to use a dry swale which will take 790 cubic metres of water into ground which their report states, “no soakage occurred during the soakage test undertaken during the site investigation. Taking account of the variable clay soil on the site and the lack of soakage, it is considered that traditional soakaways will be unsuitable for the site.”

He informed the meeting that if you have water in a swale or attenuation tank it must be pumped out and the figures for surface water must be known relative to the water table.

The Flood Risk Assessment carried out does not say how much water is to be evaporated from the site. The only reference to anything going from the site is soil drainage which is 3.70 litres per second which is a lot or a little depending on how much the drains slope.

SDNPA should approach Southern Water and ask about the capacity available to establish whether the possible flows can be accommodated. much the drainage in that area

Mr Paul Spanner, of 44 Andlers Ash Road, immediately opposite the development informed the meeting that he is currently building an extension and has had to dig footings down to 2.2m and the surface water sits at about 70 cm below the surface and as a result of that he has to pile the foundations to the extension to 15m. He expressed the view that the situation is only going to get worse for residents on Andlers Ash Road with the proposed development and that the properties further behind Andlers Ash Road will also be affected. The number of properties that will be affected are those on Andlers Ash Road and those behind. The size of drainage and flood defences that are being looked at is not sufficient for the number of houses.

Simon Kendall, of Cumbers, informed the meeting that he has walked across the fields for 35 years and has seen huge streams of water running down the fields and forming gullies and has seen Hilliers spend money taking action to clear surface water from the field. There is a problem with the viability of the proposal for Cala Homes as there is a responsibility in the village and the committee to express concern at more than 50 units not just for the flood issue but because of the practical size of the site. The LNDP refers to a buffer around the site and also to views through the site which have been reduced. Cala Homes seem to think that the track is where they can build up to and that they are aware of a legal case which give precedent to them asking for more units than the LNDP specifies. LNDP is a very good plan but Cala Homes are trying to squeeze too many properties into one area and there is reference to quality housing and these are not going to be quality but they are going to be cheapo housing.

Eric Croft does not accept the open space proposal is a substitute for what is shown in the LNDP. The layout does not reference the farm buildings for the colours and design on the site and is a nonsense of the traditional style of houses within Liss. The two sites were supposed to be separate which included separate entrances and also different house designs. This is not reflected in the application.

Margaret Effenberg who was very involved in the VDS, expressed concern at the design of the houses and that it is not a bespoke development. Expressed the view that Cala Homes do not appear to have looked at the VDS and that the wishes of the people of Liss were for housing to reflect the Victorian village. Some of the houses have chimneys at the front and these do not look right and will be out of keeping with the landscape. This needs to be looked at again.

Also the flats are "flat". It is a flat building with small windows at the side and back. it needs to be staggered to give it more character.

Expressed the view that LPC should ask Cala Homes to go back and look at the VDS and consider it.

Mr Harvey, wanted to support the flooding points already made. He resides at 92 Andlers Ash Road which is opposite the Open Space area and has a land drain at the back of his property which fills up now and so will get worse once the development is built as it got worse when the last development was built. He expressed the view that his was not the only property which will be affected by the development. He made the point that this area was one of the lowest parts of Liss and so extra care needs to be taken and supported others' comments regarding flooding and drainage issues.

Matthew Kendall, of Cumbers, expressed concern that no mention has been made of climate change which is a grave threat. Climate change will result in an increase in flooding and there does not appear to be any provision in the application to take into account the results of climate change such as the 4 degree increase in temperatures which will cause more rain. More trees should be being planted rather than removed especially in a flood plain.

Also not much in the way of sustainability – sustainable architecture and sustainable living such as flood defences, encouraging wildlife and solar panels.

He also queried the ability to build on farm land. The Chairman informed him that there is no law preventing building on farm land.

Mr Paul Spanner informed the meeting that he has photographic record of the environmental issues at the property. The Chairman reminded him that LPC is not a decision-maker on this and that he should provide the evidence to SDNPA

Mr Simon Kendall expressed the view that SDNPA are supporting the village and not making it easier for Cala to ride roughshod through the planning policies.

Mr Phil Deacon from St Mary's Road, wanted to support what John Starling said about the flooding and drainage issues and also to say that he was concerned about the design. He expressed the view that the flats over the garages look like a communist block and look very bland. On the flooding issue this is something for the technicians to work out but the land is watershed land and so need to find a way to get the water away from the site.

Mr John Starling expressed the view that the difficulty with SDNPA, is that if the LNDP states 70 houses then the SDNPA has to honour that figure and so have to find a planning solution to fit the 70 house requirement. There is no legislation that a planning officer has to deal with flooding as it is not within the jurisdiction of a planning approval to do anything about flooding. SDNPA needs to engage with Southern Water who have to report on how much water can be taken out of the site. If the infrastructure is not sufficient then Southern Water is responsible for the infrastructure and will have to cover the costs.

If you look at the main drain through coming down through Liss under Station Road every morning it is running full so the whole of the village infrastructure is running at the very edge of capacity.

Mr Peter Timney, resident of Andlers Ash Road, informed the meeting that he had already put in his comments. He informed the meeting that he was disturbed to read in the application that the SDNPA expressed the view that the site could sustain 100 houses. When there are comments like that it makes it very difficult to come back to the 70 suggested in the LNDP.

Matthew Kendall asked if the density could be reduced by making more smaller open spaces rather than one large open space.

Phil Deacon expressed the view that if LPC responds requesting a reduction in the number of 4 bed houses in favour of smaller units, Cala will want to increase the number of units to make up the difference.