



LISS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held at 19.30 hrs on 5 August 2019.

MEMBERS

*Cllr Budden ✂ Cllr Edwards Cllr Hargreaves
Cllr Jerrard Cllr Linsley *Cllr Wilson *Mrs S Halstead

*Present.

✂ Chairman

The meeting was clerked by F Cook, Assistant Parish Clerk (“APC”).

P117/19 Apologies:

117.1 Apologies were received from Cllrs Linsley and Hargreaves.

117.2 It was noted that the meeting was not quorate and that the comments of the committee regarding each application would have to be ratified at the next full Council meeting.

P118/19 Declarations of interests:

1118.1 The Chairman reminded the members to declare any pecuniary interests at the appropriate time.

P119/19 Approval of Minutes of Meeting on 8 July 2019

Resolved: The minutes of the meeting of 8 July 2019 be approved as a correct record. Proposed by Cllr Wilson and seconded by Cllr Budden and agreed by a unanimous vote.

P120/19 Matters Arising from Minutes of Meeting on 8 July 2019

120.1 Highbrook Hall Estate – Steel portal framed building for use as equestrian haybarn. It was noted that a minor amendment to the application had been made but that this did not alter the comments previously submitted.

120.2 45 Greenfields – Single storey extension etc. It was noted that a minor amendment to the application had been made but that this did not alter the comments previously submitted.

120.3 The APC noted that the SDNPA Local Plan had been adopted and asked members if they required a hard copy which she confirmed she would print out for them. **Action: APC**

120.4 The Chairman informed the meeting that the application relating to The Oaks, St Marys Road would be taken by EHDC and had not been called in by the SDNPA. He confirmed that the decision would be by committee but that there would probably be a site visit so the application would probably not come to committee until October 2019.

P121/19 Planning Applications Received for Consultation

121.1 **19/03210/FUL – Land North East of Andlers Ash Road – Provision of SANG to incorporate a circular footpath route with links to existing rights of way, fencing and signage**
The Chairman made some introductory comments and then suggested that the meeting be adjourned to enable public participation, which was agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.40pm to enable public participation.

See the Appendix A for minutes of the public participation.

The meeting was re-convened at 8.00pm.

Cllr Wilson informed the meeting that he had a non-pecuniary interest in this application as he used to know Robert Hillier, Chairman of the company which owns the land.

The Chairman read a letter received from Angela Wright in support of the application.

Mrs Halstead informed the meeting that she considered it was premature to take a decision on the information so far provided and that a detailed survey by Hampshire Wildlife Trust and a report from the Environment Agency regarding the risk of flooding should be obtained and that an investigation into the possibility of unacceptable parking levels in Rotherbank Farm Lane should be carried out.

She commented that it was an important area of land and so the committee needs to be certain what is proposed is suitable for the future management of the land.

The Chairman noted that the applicant should provide a justification for not adhering to Natural England's guidelines and expressed concern about the proposal to permit dogs off the lead.

Cllr Wilson stated that he had concerns over:-

1. parking on Rotherbank Farm Lane
2. permitting dogs into the area given that it is a sensitive habitat and there are plenty of other dog-walking areas in Liss and the upper part of the proposed SANG would be more suitable for people to enjoy tranquilly as a nature reserve
3. the fact that the greenspace is some distance from the Andlers Ash development and would, therefore, not so directly meet the needs of the new residents there
4. the danger to horses from the proposed fence

Mrs Halstead questioned whether there could be implications of having a SANG considerably larger than is needed to satisfy the requirements for the Andlers Ash development and the effect that may have on future development applications.

The Chairman also states that he thought it was not acceptable for dogs to be encouraged to go into the River Rother as it was a danger to wildlife and the river could be dangerous for dogs.

Following further discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC COULD NOT MAKE A DECISION WHETHER TO OBJECT** to the planning application for the following reasons:-

1. a detailed survey by Hampshire Wildlife Trust should be obtained assessing the impact the proposed application will have on wildlife on / using the land and also the impact of the proposed intention to permit dogs off the lead on the wildlife on / using the land.
2. the Environment Agency should be consulted on the likelihood of flooding
3. an assessment is made of the likely impact of the proposed SANG and those visiting it on parking on Rotherbank Farm Lane
4. the proposal does not sufficiently justify the non-adherence to Natural England's guidelines for SANGs

121.2 **19/03541/FUL – Ponticum, Farther Common Lane – Replacement of a single dwellinghouse with a new-build single dwellinghouse, landscaping and associated works**

Following a brief introduction by the Chairman the meeting was adjourned to enable public participation.

The meeting was adjourned at 8.15pm to enable public participation.

See the Appendix B for minutes of the public participation.

The meeting was re-convened at 8.27pm.

The Chairman asked for comments.

Mrs Halstead said that the proposed design appears to sit well in the landscape and include many welcome sustainable features however, expressed concern that to permit the application would drive a coach and horses through planning policy SD30 and would set a dangerous precedent for future planning applications. She expressed the view that the Council should object to the application and state that if minded to approve the application the planning authority should set out its reasoning very clearly so that they apply only to this specific application and do not set a precedent. She also commented that she would prefer the decision to be made by the SDNPA and not EHDC under the delegated authority as she felt that the SDNPA should determine such an early test of SD30. She further stated that Policy SD30 must be robust and so any exception circumstances which make breaching SD30 must be set out clearly.

Cllr Wilson noted that policy 6.3 of the Village Design Statement provides that “Depending upon the setting and visibility of the site, exceptionally innovative buildings of a bold contemporary design may be appropriate provided their design is of high quality and they are fitting to the locality”. He informed the meeting that he thought that the design could be exemplary and a local land mark which it would be good if the public and interested professionals (e.g. from the Whitehill and Bordon “green town”) could visit it from time to time. Mrs Halstead confirmed that she did not mind the design itself but it was the size and Cllr Wilson agreed that it was important that SD30 was protected.

The Chairman noted that the red line indicating the Settlement Policy Boundary is incorrectly marked on the application plan but that this did not affect the property which is shown as being outside the Settlement Policy Boundary.

He agreed with the comments already made that he did not mind the design and liked the winter garden but he was concerned at the size and the breach of SD30 and that a clear decision was required from SDNPA on what exceptional circumstances are.

He commented that the architects of today are creating the listed buildings of tomorrow.

Mrs Halstead also noted that the application must comply with the SDNPA’s Dark Skies policy.

Following further discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD OBJECT** to the planning application for the following reasons:-

1. the proposed application exceeds the 30% increase permitted under policy SD30 (“Replacement Dwellings”). The additional 30% is based on the size of the property as at 18 December 2002 which means that the extensions to the property approved by planning applications in 2013 and 2018 should be excluded when calculating the size of the property under SD30. Excluding those two recent extant implementable permissions from the calculation means that the current application greatly exceeds the 30% limit set in SD30.
2. given the importance of this early test of SD30, LPC thinks this application should be decided by the SDNPA and not by EHDC under the delegated authority.

If the planning authority is minded to grant permission for the application, LPC requests that the planning authority:-

1. set out the exception circumstances of the application which justify the breach of policy SD30 so as to ensure that a general precedent is not set by this application breaching SD30
2. the planning authority ensure that the proposed application complies with the SDNPA’s Dark Skies policy set out in SD8.

121.3 **19/03109/FUL – St Peter’s Church, Church Street – Retention and continued use of Shepherds Hut in churchyard for Sunday School**

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD OBJECT** to the planning application requesting permanent permission for the siting of the Shepherds Hut but

would not object to another three year temporary permission.

- 121.4 **19/03282/FUL – 50 Station Road** – Change of use of ground floor from Dry Cleaners (Use Class A1) to Dental Surgery (Use Class D1), alterations to the external elevations and associated works

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD OBJECT** to the design of the proposed development as the proposed changes to the shop front are in breach of:-

1. policy 4.3 of the Village Design Statement which states that “Planning policies to protect Conservation Areas should be strictly applied. This should include period shop fronts, which should be conserved using their original features and detailing, and employing sensitive decoration, signing and lighting”.
2. The Shopfront and Signs Design Guide for East Hampshire which provides that “In Conservation Areas it is the policy of the Council to seek to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the streetscape”

and accordingly, the recessed central front door should be retained and the windows should be clear, plain glass. LPC has no objection to the proposed change of use.

- 121.5 **19/03350/LDP – Wyndham, Plantation Road, Hill Brow** – LDE for a single storey rear extension built off the original rear wall and for two porches off existing external doors

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.

- 121.6 **19/03343/LPE – Wyndham, Plantation Road, Hill Brow** – LDE for two outbuildings for ancillary residential use

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD OBJECT** to the planning application on the grounds that LPC believes that the proposed development exceeds the 30% ruled of SD30.

- 121.7 **16 Patricks Copse Road, GU33 7DL** – Single storey extension to rear and side following demolition of part of kitchen / dining room (amended plan received 22.07.2019)

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.

- 121.8 **19/03574/OHL – The Old Brickyard, Hawkley Road** – Overhead cable and pole replacement

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.

- 121.9 **19/03576/OHL – High Firs Cottage, Warren Road** – Overhead cable and pole replacement

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application.

- 121.10 **19/03535/HOUS – Heatherlands, Warren Road** – Orangery to rear (size 6500 x 5000)

Following discussion **IT WAS RESOLVED THAT LPC SHOULD NOT OBJECT** to the planning application provided that the proposed development does not exceed the 30% rule in SD30.

P122/19 SDNPA Applications Approved: It was noted that the following applications had been approved.

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
19/02060/HOUS	Mendip Cottage, Flexcombe Lane, GU33 6LH	Change of use of attached barn into habitable accommodation, following demolition of existing lean-to; creation of new openings and internal alterations
19/02801/OHL	18 Andlers Ash	Free standing wooden pole replacing existing pole – overhead

	Road, GU33 7LL	lines
18/06081/HOUS	Hangery, Hill Brow Road, GU33 7LH	Two two-storey side extensions, two-storey rear extension, first floor balconies to side, single storey side extensions and detached two bay garage following the demolition of the existing garage and store (amended plans received 04.06.2019. Description amended 06.06.2019. Ecology report received 06.06.2019)

P123/19 SDNPA Applications Refused: It was noted that the following application had been refused.

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
SDNP/19/00782/FUL	129 Forest Road, Liss, GU33 7BP	Retention of the subdivision of the planning unit to create two dwellings. (additional information received on 27/05/2019)

P124/19 SDNPA Applications Appeals: It was noted that the following applications had been appealed.

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Comment By</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
18/03121/FUL	15.08.19	71 Station Road, GU33 7AD	Retention and continued use of part of site from Use Class D2 to use Class D1 (State Registered Nursery)
18/05031/OUT	16.08.19	The Grange, Farnham Rd, GU33 6JE	Outline application – 5 new detached dwellings on the land known as Plot 4a with some matters reserved – access, layout and scale (revised proposal reduced from the initially proposed scheme for 7 dwellings)

P125/19 SDNPA Applications Withdrawn: It was noted that the following application had been withdrawn.

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
19/01085/HOUS	Rose Cottage, Hill Brow Road, GU33 7LE	Removal of Chimneys

P126/19 TPO Applications – Referred to the Tree Warden:

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.

<u>Ref. Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>
19/03478/TCA	The Croft, Limes Close, Liss, GU33 7DR	T1 – Weeping Willow - Fell

Resolved: Liss Parish Council would follow the advice of Mark Welby and object to the application on the basis that no reason has been given for its removal and its size could be contained through proper management rather than felling. Mark Welby also indicated that the tree was worthy of a Tree Preservation Order.

P127/19 TPO Applications Approved: It was noted that no applications had been approved.

P128/19 TPO Made: It was noted that no TPOs had been made.

P129/19 Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan Monitoring

129.1 It was noted that a new officer had been appointed.

P130/19 Any Other Business

130.1 The Chairman informed the meeting that he had received notice of enforcement action being taken regarding the erection of extra living space to the side of 88 – 90 Station Road, Liss.

130.2 The Chairman informed the meeting that in respect of Warren Road, Natural England had no objection to the proposed development because they considered it would have no affect on the SINC. The APC noted that a decision had been given on only one of the two Warren Road applications, the one for a variation of conditions, but that the decision notice referred to the

retention of the shelter which was the other application which was showing as still being determined. The Chairman confirmed that he would follow this up with the EHDC Officers.

Action: Chairman

- 130.3 The Chairman informed the meeting that amended plans had been submitted in respect of The Liss Mill but that although the number of solar panels had been reduced they would still be highly visible in the landscape. Following discussion it was unanimously agreed that LPC's objection to the planning application should stand and not be varied.
- 130.4 The Chairman noted that members of the committee may have seen the article in the Petersfield Post regarding the call out for large sites for the local plan. The Chairman explained the history to this second call out and confirmed that it had put the process back at least three months.
- 130.5 Cllr Wilson asked what should be done about the decisions made at this evening's meeting as the committee was not quorate. Following discussion, during which it was noted that the deadlines for the submission of comments on the various planning applications were all prior to the next full Council meeting, it was also noted that either the committee should be made smaller or other people should join it so as to make it easier to achieve a quorum. Following further discussion it was agreed that the APC should forward the minutes to Cllr Hargreaves and request that he confirm his agreement to the decisions made.

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

The meeting was closed at 9.20pm.

.....
Chairman

Next Meeting: 2 September 2019 at 7.30pm

Appendix A

1. Judy Stickler from Liss Forest Residents Association, who resides on Rotherbank Farm Lane made the following comments:-
 - 1.1. the residents of Rotherbank Farm Lane are worried that their road will be adversely affected by people using the SANG parking in their road which will cause huge inconvenience to residents especially if they use the four visitor spaces available to visitors of residents.
 - 1.2. whilst the Cala Homes development requires the provision of Greenspace, the proposed Greenspace is not near the development so is not necessarily going to benefit the occupiers of the new houses on Andlers Ash Road.
 - 1.3. the care home at the end of Rotherbank Farm Lane frequently has visitors who park on the road which causes problems for residents and the refuse van and additional parking on the road will increase the problems.
 - 1.4. she was concerned that the circular path will disturb a natural habitat where there are deer and fox every day. The intrusion of people into this environment will have an adverse effect on that natural habitat.
 - 1.5. she also expressed concern how emergency vehicles would access the area if necessary and was advised by the APC that there would be a collapsible bollard at the end of the Riverside Walk.

2. Paddy Payne of Kippences Barn made the following comments:-
 - 2.1. the proposed SANG is too big and three times larger than required for the Cala Homes application.
 - 2.2. he is concerned that Hilliers will have step-in rights in future applications.
 - 2.3. the SANG is intended for the benefit of the new residents of Andlers Ash Road but has been put on land which cannot be developed instead of being on land adjoining Andlers Ash Road which could possibly be developed at a future date.
 - 2.4. the Ecology plan is worthless as it is inaccurate as it fails to refer to deer and badger and other animals on the land. The land is currently an untouched natural open space and an undisturbed natural habitat.
 - 2.5. Liss is already well served with dog walking places and so it is not necessary to disturb this site especially with dogs off the lead which have already killed a deer on the land.
 - 2.6. the application does not make sense as it refers to erecting stockproof fencing so that livestock can graze part of the land but dogs cannot be let off the lead if there are grazing livestock. If the existing post and rail fence is retained, dogs cannot be let off the lead as they will get into his adjoining land and “worry” his horses.
 - 2.7. the proposed SANG does not meet Natural England’s guidelines which state that there should not be any hard landscaping and the application includes elevated wooden walkways and gravel footpaths.
 - 2.8. he had been asked by Brian Mayo to add that the land is boggy for most of the year and has suffered flooding in the past and that he recommends a site meeting.

Appendix B

Richard Dollamore, the planning consultant, attended the meeting on behalf of the applicant.

He informed the meeting that:-

1. the site was well enclosed by trees and hedges so it was difficult to see the property from the public highway.
2. permission was granted for an extension in 2013 and in 2018 for the new outhouse for swimming pool and winter garden. The first of these had been partially implemented and the second was still implementable and would be implemented if this application was unsuccessful.
3. the applicant does not want to build in accordance with those planning applications as they would result in an ugly building and they want to create something that was more attractive.
4. the proposed new dwelling would be single storey hence the larger footprint, but being single storey it would be less visible in the landscape.
5. he was aware of SD30 but that the intention of SD30 was to protect small dwellings and ensure the landscape impact is not increased by a large increase in size. The fact that the property will now be single storey means that it will have a lesser impact in the landscape.