

BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 31 May 2016

Present: Cllrs Brown, Dean, Francis, Greenwood and Thornton

In Attendance: Mr D Hillier-Wheal

Public Session 5 members of the public were present

PLAN_1617_M03/

22. Election of Chair

22.1 Proposed Cllr Thornton, Seconded Cllr Greenwood **RESOLVED** unanimously that Cllr Sue Toher be elected as Chair of the Planning Committee for 2016 – 2017.

23. Election of Vice-Chair

23.1 Proposed Cllr Greenwood, Seconded Cllr Brown, **RESOLVED** unanimously that Cllr Mike Thornton be elected as Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee for 2016 – 2017.

24. Apologies for Absence

24.1 Apologies had been received and accepted from Cllr Toher (holiday)

25. To adopt and sign Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 26 April 2016

25.1 The Committee, by virtue of no current member being present on 26 April, agreed to defer adopting and signing the minutes until Cllr Toher returns from holiday.

26. Matters arising from the above Minutes)

26.1 None raised.

27. Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

27.1 None declared or sought.

28. To consider supporting the request from residents bordering the Cemex site to relocate planned tree planting

28.1 A member of the public, Mr Barnett, requested to speak at this point. Mr Barnett explained that as a resident of Church Road, and having a property bordering the development on Breach Lane, he had some concerns about the plans. The plans he had seen showed a screen of trees next to his property, when none had previously been planned. As the trees would be only a few metres from the rear of his house they would effectively block the light from the rear of his property. At the same time, a screen of trees that had been planned for the North of the site, shielding another resident from being clearly visible from the allotments, had seemingly been removed.

28.2 Another member of the public, Miss Beven, who is the resident that would be affected by the removed screen of trees, also spoke. She suggested that what the residents would prefer is that the tree planting planned for near to Mr Barnett's property be relocated to near hers.

Initial: _____ Date: _____

28.3 Mr Barnett also stated that a large pile of earth had been placed at the rear of his property during the development. He would appreciate it if it could be watered regularly to prevent dust being blown across his property.

28.3 The Clerk had obtained the most recent planning documents which appear to show the trees arranged as the residents would like.

28.4 Proposed Cllr Greenwood, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the Committee support the residents' requests and ask Eastleigh Borough Council monitoring officers to ensure that the tree placement is according to the latest plans viewable on the EBC website.

Action: Clerk

Four members of the public left at this point

29. To consider the Committee's response to the EE phone mast upgrade consultation

29.1 Proposed Cllr Francis, Seconded Cllr Brown, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the committee raise no objection to the upgrade of the phone mast.

29.2 The Clerk was asked to include a request that EE maintain the existing colour scheme when upgrading the mast.

Action: Clerk

30. Consideration of Planning Applications

30.1 C/16/78356 - 113 Spring Lane – Ground & first floor side & two storey rear extensions – this had already been permitted by Eastleigh Borough Council and was noted by the Committee.

30.2 F/16/78411 - 4 Beaver Drive – Two storey side & single storey rear extension – Raise no objection.

30.3 F/16/78481 - 33 New Road – Single storey rear extension following removal of conservatory – Raise no objection.

30.4 N/16/78392 - Oakbank – Pollard 1 Willow tree – this had already been permitted by Eastleigh Borough Council and was noted by the Committee.

31. Report on recent planning decision

31.1 F/16/77859 – 189 Fair Oak Road - Single storey rear extension – Raise no objection – Permitted

31.2 F/16/78145 – 4 Dolphin Close – Two storey side extension – Raise no objection – Permitted

31.3 T/16/78205 – 4 Church Close – Reduction in height by 3m and crown reduction by 1m to 1 Holm Oak – Objected on the grounds of it being a healthy tree with a TPO – Consent

31.4 F/16/78110 – 28 Horton Way – Two storey rear extension, single storey rear extension and enlargement of existing dormer – Objected on the grounds of overdevelopment not in keeping with the area – Permitted

31.5 U/16/78216 – 34 St Marys Road – Application for certificate of lawfulness for proposed use – Raise no objection – Certificate issued

31.6 F/16/78215 – 34 St Marys Road – Single storey rear extension – Raise no objection – Permitted

31.7 F/16/78270 – 14 Salmon Drive – Erection of detached garage – Raise no objection – Refused on the grounds of excessive scale, loss of light, detracting from the character of the existing dwelling

Initial: _____ Date: _____

31.8 F/16/78114 – 4 Squirrel Close – Pitched roof over existing single storey side extension and roof light – Raise no objection – permitted

31.9 T/16/78254 – 13 Otter Close – Fell 1 Oak and crown reduce 1 Oak – Object subject to a report from a tree surgeon detailing possible pruning of 1 Oak – Part consent part refuse

32. Clerk's Report

32.1 The Clerk followed up recent emails regarding the site meeting held at the Cemetery development with representatives from Bellway. The remaining question is whether the Council should keep the current temporary path at all. Options are to remove it completely, following complaints from those using it to access the Old Cemetery, keep it in place until the development is finished, or once the development is complete to improve and make it a permanent feature. Bellway's position is that the temporary path is never intended to be the sole way people can access the Cemetery during the development – there will always be vehicle access as before. The Committee asked the Clerk to put the matter to the whole Council.

Action: Clerk

32.2 Bellway had also asked about the layout of the New Cemetery. They have offered to scrape and flatten the majority of the area, and use the soil to raise the low portion of the New Cemetery.

32.3 The Clerk also reported to the Committee that there will be a need for new fencing around both Cemeteries, and some thought will need to be given as to its type and look. The Committee asked the Clerk to enquire again about the possibility of the bridleway being moved.

Action: Clerk

32.4 The Clerk informed the Committee that the Cemex development have uncovered a Roman / Iron Age site. Cllr Tidridge had volunteered to take the lead and will report back to the Council on any matters of interest. Once the site has been properly excavated and catalogued there may well be the potential for a site visit by the Council.

32.5 Cllr Francis told the Committee that a resident had reported development lorries travelling after 10pm. The Clerk was asked to find out if there are rules about when the lorries are allowed to travel.

Action: Clerk

33. Date, time and place of next meeting

33.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 14 June at 7:00pm in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke

34. Motion for confidential business

34.1 Proposed Cllr Thornton, Seconded Cllr Brown, **RESOLVED** unanimously that in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be discussed relating to possible breaches of planning regulation it was 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 Clerk reported on four alleged breaches of planning regulations.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 8:25pm