

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee
held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke
commencing at 7.00pm on 12 November 2019**

Present: Cllrs Brown (Chair), Dean, Francis, Greenwood and Toher

In Attendance: Mr D Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)
Mrs S Thorogood (Assistant Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)

Public Attendance: 0 members of the public were present

PLAN_1920_M13/

Public Session

126 Apologies for Absence

126.1 All Councillors were present.

127 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 29 October 2019

127.1 The Minutes of the above meeting had been circulated prior to the meeting.

127.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Greenwood, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 29 October 2019 be accepted as a true record.

128 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes not covered elsewhere on the agenda

128.1 The Clerk informed the Committee that, due to the election, the planned Bishopstoke, Fair Oak & Horton Heath Local Area Committee meeting for November had been cancelled. The consideration by the LAC of application F/19/86438 – 58-64 Stoke Common Road – would now not take place until January 2020 at the earliest. The January meeting is set for Wednesday 29th January at the Bishopstoke Methodist Church on Sedgwick Road, starting at 7pm.

129 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

129.1 There were no declarations or requests.

130 Consideration of Planning Applications

130.1 F/19/86166 – 27 Haig Road – Construction of detached 3-bedroom dwellinghouse with associated car parking, following removal of existing outbuildings – The Committee noted that this application has been commented on before and that as revised plans were being submitted using the original application number but the consultation period had now ended there was no easy way for anyone to comment or object. In addition to the Committee's previous response it was agreed to request that any new dwelling be tile hung and not timber clad (as in the plans) in order to be in keeping with the local street scene and that responses to the application be dated so that it is possible to tell whether comments were made before or after alterations to the planning documents.

130.2 NC/19/86663 – 86A Spring Lane – Notification of intent.

1 no. Western Red Cedar (T1)- trim by up to 2-3 metres and shape to just above burnt section; 1 no. Yew (T2)- reduce lateral canopy towards house by 1.8m and crown lift to 3.5m over garden; 1 no. Lucombe Oak (T3) - crown lift to 4m by removing 1 X 120mm branch and 1x 100mm branch and 1x 80mm secondary branch - EBC owned; 1 no. Yew (T4) crown lift to 3.5m over garden and reduce lateral spread by 2m over garden; 1 Group - Hollies and Laurel (G1)- prune back to boundary - EBC owned; 1 no. Lucombe Oak (T5) - prune lower 2 branches to boundary and reduce lower lateral branches by 2m. EBC owned; 1 group Hollies (G2) - prune back to boundary - EBC owned; 1 no. Lucombe Oak (T6) - reduce lower lateral canopy by 1.5m - EBC owned.

The Clerk explained that there is a hierarchy of protection for trees: at the bottom are trees with no protection in planning law, then come those trees situated in a conservation area and finally the greatest protections are afforded to those trees given a Tree Protection Order (TPO). In this case the trees are said to be within a conservation area and so the Committee's only options are to request a TPO be placed on some or all of the trees, or to not object. Cllr Toher noted that as some of the trees belong to the Borough Council it is of some concern that they do not appear to be managing their own trees in a timely fashion. The Committee agreed to comment to this effect in their response.

130.3 F/19/86601 – 12 West Drive – Retrospective application for change of use of domestic garage to motorcycle workshop – The Clerk noted that this was a late addition to the agenda, having come to light as a result of checking weekly lists of planning applications and not by being notified by the Borough Council. The Committee agreed to raise no objection but to comment that they would not like to see the hours of operation increase and that if the business began to impact on neighbouring properties the situation should be re-assessed.

131 To agree comments to be made to the Borough Council regarding the need for correct details to be given on planning applications

131.1 The Committee agreed to request the Clerk contact Andy Grandfield at the Borough Council to raise concerns about the accuracy of planning applications online. This follows recent examples where house numbers have been either wrong or confusing; planning detail not matching that described on the application form; documents not being uploaded to the planning portal and the continuing issue of the Planning Committee not receiving notifications when it should

Action: Clerk

132 Report on recent planning decisions

132.1 H/19/86225 – 37 Rogers Road – Retention of outbuilding – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application – The Borough Council Permitted this application.

132.2 H/19/86360 – 36 Spring Lane – Proposed rear single storey extension. Hip to gable roof alteration and rear dormer. (Loft conversion Hip to gable and rear dormer under permitted development) – The Committee strongly objects to this application. The Committee is aware that the previous application for this extension was refused and yet work continued. The Committee also believes that the only section that has been removed from this current version of the plans has already been built. The Committee believes all the reasons given for the refusal of the application last time are still just as valid and so will object on the following grounds:

1) The side and rear extension, including those sections already built despite the refusal of the previous application, and single storey rear extension, by way of its height, siting and excessive built form, would appear awkward and incongruous resulting in a top heavy and disproportionate appearance which is out of character with the area. The proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policy 59.BE, Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 Policy DM1 and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011);

Initial: _____ Date: _____

2) The proposal due to its design, massing and siting will have an overbearing and oppressive visual impact on the occupiers of 38 Spring Lance, contrary to Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policy 59.BE, Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 Policy DM1, and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011), and

3) The proposed development fails to provide adequate provision for on-site car parking which would encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway and so interrupt the free flow of traffic and cause a hazard to road users. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy 104.T of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review [2001-2011] and the Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards SPD (2009)

The Borough Council permitted this application.

132.3 H/19/86402 – 15 Underwood Road – Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application – The Borough Council permitted this application.

132.4 T/19/86439 – 7 East Drive – 1 no. Lime T1 - Reduce tree by up to 2m all round to previous points of reduction removing epicormic growth to 3m in height, crown lift to 4m over the driveway and clearing utility lines by 1m. A resident indicated that they wished to speak on this application. They identified themselves as the resident of 7 East Drive and stated that they strongly opposed the application. The resident read from a written statement which is included in these minutes as Appendix A. Cllr Toher indicated that if this is, as stated, the last lime tree from those planted 130 years ago then it is of great significance. Also, Cllr Toher noted that Bishopstoke Parish Council has recently declared a climate change emergency and in light of that the Committee should seek to oppose unnecessary work on trees. The Committee agreed to object to the application as the tree is of historic importance and is a haven for local wildlife, some of which is rare. The Borough Council part refused and part consented to this application.

132.5 T/19/86440 – Bishopstoke Manor, Church Road – 1 no. Ginko biloba (T1) - prune back from building to give up to 2m clearance – The Committee noted that this tree was actually in the conservation area, despite the application form stating that it is not. The Committee therefore wished to object on the grounds that the tree is in the Conservation Area – The Borough Council consented to this application.

133 Clerk's Report

133.1 Actions from previous meetings:

Minute 118.3 Comments to the Borough Council have been discussed at this meeting.

133.2 The Clerk informed the Committee that in addition to Breach Lane allotments, the new play area space at Breach Lane has also been placed on its 12-month maintenance period. However, despite reports to the contrary, Stoke Common Cemetery has not.

134 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting

134.1 The next regular meeting will be on Tuesday 26th November 2019, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications.

134.2 Any agenda items for the meeting should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 18th November 2019.

135 Motion for Confidential Business

135.1 As the Clerk indicated he had no confidential business for the Committee and no Councillor wished to raise anything under confidential business, this was not moved.

Initial: _____ Date: _____

136 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential Business)

136.1 The Clerk reported no new alleged breaches of Development Control.

136.2 The Clerk reported no concluded breaches of Development Control.

136.3 Cllrs reported no additional items of confidential business

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.26pm

Chair's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Clerk's Signature: _____ Date: _____