



## Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held at Bishopstoke Methodist Church commencing at 7:00pm on 13 August 2024

**Present:** Cllrs Moore (Vice Chair), Daly, Hillier-Wheal and Mignot (from para 32)

**In Attendance:** Mr D Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)  
Mrs E Earl (Admin Officer to Bishopstoke Parish Council)

**Public Attendance:** 0 members of the public were present.

**PLAN\_2425\_M05/**

### Public Session

#### 28 Apologies for Absence

28.1 Cllr Scott was not present.

#### 29 To adopt and sign the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 23 July 2024

29.1 The minutes of the above meeting had been included with the document pack for the meeting.

29.2 Proposed Cllr Daly, Seconded Cllr Hillier-Wheal, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 23 July 2024 be adopted as a true record.

**Action: Clerk and Chair – to sign and publish the minutes and document pack**

#### 30 Declarations of interest and requests for dispensation

30.1 No declarations or requests were made.

#### 31 Consideration of Planning Applications

31.1 H/24/97729 – 141 Underwood Road – Single Storey Side Extension to replace and enlarge the existing – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to this planning application.

31.2 T/24/97849 – 1 Spring Lane – 1no. Yew (T4239) - Crown reduction by 2m to height only, including reducing lateral spread by 1m only. Crown lift over public footpath only to 3.5m above ground level. No pruning wounds to exceed 50mm in dia. Major basal & stem decay to Northeast side up to 3.5m above grd level. Works required to ensure mass loading of canopy is significantly reduced to lower section of stem based around cavity area & rooting section – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to this application.

31.3 H/24/97788 – 101 Stoke Common Road – Removal of existing porch and replace with single-storey porch/conservatory – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to this planning application.

31.4 O/20/89498 – Land at Burnetts Lane, Fir Tree Lane and Allington Lane – Outline: Phased mixed-use development comprising severable and separate phases of development (as per the Phasing Plan) – Environmental Statement Addendum added July 2024 – The Committee agreed to resubmit their previous objection to this application, which is included as Appendix A in these minutes.

31.5 There were no late applications to consider.

31.6 Proposed Cllr Daly, Seconded Cllr Hillier-Wheat, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the responses of the Planning Committee be submitted as minuted above.

**Action: Clerk – add the responses of the Planning Committee to the planning portal**

*Cllr Mignot arrived at this point*

**32 To receive the Clerk’s report on recent planning decisions and other matters**

32.1 The Clerk’s written report had been included with the supporting papers for this meeting and was noted by the Committee.

**33 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

33.1 The next meeting of the Planning Committee is scheduled to take place on Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> August at 7:00pm in Bishopstoke Methodist Church. The Committee agreed to provisionally cancel that meeting subject to no complex applications coming forward. The next meeting is now expected to be on Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> September. If Cllrs wish to add anything to the agenda the Clerk noted that the item, and any supporting papers, should be with him by Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> September.

33.2 Proposed Cllr Mignot, Seconded Cllr Moore, **RESOLVED** unanimously to cancel the 27<sup>th</sup> August meeting unless applications come forward that Committee members feel should be discussed.

**Action: Clerk – notify Committee members of any applications that could be considered at the 27<sup>th</sup> August meeting**

**34 Motion for confidential business**

34.1 Proposed Cllr Moore, Seconded Cllr Daly, **RESOLVED** unanimously that in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be discussed relating to possible breaches of planning regulation it is advisable in the public interest that the public be excluded and for the record the business be regarded as confidential.

**35 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential business)**

35.1 The report on alleged breaches of development control had been included with the supporting papers for this meeting and was noted by the Committee.

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7:16pm*

Chair's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Clerk's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## O/20/89498 & F/20/89500 Burnetts Lane, Fir Tree Lane and Allington Lane

Bishopstoke Parish Council Planning Committee has a number of objections to the proposed development for the Burnetts Lane and surrounding areas.

With the proposed 2,500 residential units in O/20/89498 and 393 in F/20/89500 it is inevitable that there will be a major impact on the local road network, both during construction and once these units are occupied. There is no proposal for a new railway station to take some of the burden so there will be a dramatic increase in car journeys and this will have a large negative effect on the Bishopstoke / Fair Oak Road. Concomitant with this will be all the extra pollution such a traffic increase will bring, and the detrimental effect this will have on local air quality and health. Additionally, the proposed new road connection will bring in increased HGV traffic onto increasingly congested roads, with the prospect of even greater use of the "ratruns" throughout Bishopstoke.

Whilst there is a commitment to having 35% affordable housing in each of these developments there is a large question over the definition of "affordable housing" as most dwellings of this type remain out of the reach of first time buyers or renters. Additionally, a proportion of the development is planned to be Class 2 residential which the Committee understands to mean that these units will not be included when the requirement for affordable housing is calculated. This means the headline figure of 35% is misleading as it does not actually apply to the whole of the development.

The Committee retains its concern, expressed in previous applications, that the Borough Council is both the applicant and the decision maker with regard to this application. Whilst it is acknowledged that this may be standard practice it leaves the Borough Council open to suggestions that it may not apply the same scrutiny to these applications as it would to others.

The Committee believes that there will be enormous potential problems with floodwater, and even with ordinary drainage of rainfall, as the use of SuDS has been fraught with complications and failures in other recent developments. The River Itchen is at risk from any water runoff, as therefore is the whole of the local ecosystem. The local sewage system is already at or beyond capacity and whilst the Committee notes a plan to use tanks and hauliers to move sewage to treatment

plants in other areas this will, of course, increase the traffic on local roads even further.

Finally, the Committee does not see how these developments can be gone ahead with in a way that sits comfortably with the Borough Council's declaration of a climate emergency. Replacing natural landscape with concrete, risking damage to the local ecosystem, dramatically increasing traffic and pollution – these are not things that are designed to help the climate, but can only do further damage.

For these reasons Bishopstoke Parish Council Planning Committee objects strongly to both application O/20/89498 and application F/20/89500.