

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee
held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke
commencing at 7.00pm on 8 October 2019**

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

In Attendance: Mr D Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)

Public Attendance: 1 members of the public was present (for para 100.4)

PLAN_1920_M10/

96 Apologies for Absence

96.1 Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Brown.

97 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24 September 2019

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

97.2 Proposed Cllr Dean, Seconded Cllr Greenwood, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24 September 2019 be accepted as a true record.

98 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

98.1 There were no matters arising from the minutes.

99 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

99.1 There were no declarations or requests.

100 Consideration of Planning Applications

100.1 T/19/86375 – 26 Itchen Avenue – 1 no. Oak - Crown lift and clean to provide clearance of the streetlight (approx. 4.5 metres) – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application.

100.2 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.

100.3 T/19/86398 – Friarmayne, Church Road – 1 Ash: Cut back lowest limb over property by 2-3m to clear property; 1 Pine: reduce branches growing into Cedar by up to 2m to allow Cedar to develop – This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

A resident arrived at this point

100.4 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 resident left at this point

100.5 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.

100.6 H/19/86431 – 13 Earls Close – Loft conversion including rear dormer with 2no. rooflights to front roof slope and addition of front dormer – The Committee wished to comment that checks would be needed to ensure that there is enough parking space for the dwelling should the application be granted.

Consideration of planning applications that arrived after the publication of this agenda

100.7 F/19/86348 – 58-64 Stoke Common Road - Construction of 10No. three bedroom semi-detached dwellings, 2No. three bedroom detached dwellings and 4No. three bedroom detached chalet dwellings will ancillary parking, amenity space and landscaping following demolition of Nos.58-64 Stoke Common Road – The Clerk informed the Committee that despite the full paperwork being brought to the Parish Office by the developer, there had still been no official notification of the application from the Borough. As the deadline for responses falls after the Planning Committee meeting the Committee agreed to defer consideration of this until then. Additionally the Clerk was requested to formally complain to the Borough Council that no notification was received.

Action: Clerk

Clerk's note: The late notification from the Borough Council arrived the day following the meeting.

101 Report on recent planning decisions

101.1 F/19/86044 – Brookfield Car Boot, Allington Lane – Change of use of agricultural barn to B8 storage (part retrospective)– The committee felt that this was not an appropriate change of use as it removed the barn completely from agricultural use. It was agreed that the Parish Council would object on the grounds that this application would contravene saved policy 1.CO from the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan Review 2001-11 in that it is not necessary for agricultural, forestry or horticultural purposes; it is not for, or ancillary to, outdoor recreational use and it is not for public utility or education purposes. Additionally, it contravenes saved policy 5.CO from the 2001-11 Review as it is not directly linked to an existing agricultural enterprise – The Borough Council refused this planning application.

101.2 H/19/86188 – 6 Edward Avenue – Single Storey Front/Side Extension – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application – The Borough Council permitted this application.

101.3 NC/19/86366 – Old St Mary's Churchyard – Fell 1 Ash – The Committee had not considered this application as it had been made by the Parish Council – The Borough Council raised no objection to the application.

102 Clerk's Report

102.1 The Clerk reported he had had a reply from the Environment Agency which, whilst informative, did not answer the question that had been posed. The Clerk indicated he would ask again about being included in future Environment Agency consultations affecting Bishopstoke.

Action: Clerk

Initial: _____ Date: _____

102.2 Cllr Parker-Jones had been chasing the Borough Council on behalf of the Parish regarding the applications at 27 Haig Road and at 36 Spring Lane. It has now been confirmed that 27 Haig Road will use soakaways for storm drainage. Also the loft conversion at 36 Spring Lane is considered permitted development, however there are issues with a window that needs altering. There is now a second application for the remainder of the works which is being considered by the Borough Council.

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

103.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 22nd October 2019, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications.

103.2 Any agenda items should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 14th October 2019.

104 Motion for Confidential Business

104.1 Proposed Cllr Greenwood, Seconded Cllr Toher, **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.

105 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential Business)

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

105.2 The Clerk reported four concluded breaches of Development Control.

Action: Clerk

105.3 Cllrs reported no additional items of confidential business

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.30pm

Chair's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Clerk's Signature: _____ Date: _____

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee
held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke
commencing at 7.00pm on 8 October 2019**

PLAN_1920_M10/Appendix A

Statement from resident of 7 East Drive regarding the application for tree works at 7 East Drive

This tree is over 150 years old and the last one in an avenue of Limes to the Longmead Estate. I have lived here for 30 years and it has never caused any problems, it is an asset to and greatly enhances the area, it is not dead, diseased or dying as the landlord states is their policy when any work is requested on trees on their properties so any work would be purely for cosmetic reasons requested by the new neighbour at number 9 who has concerns about leaves and twigs falling on his Jaguar.

The tree has a myriad of wildlife living in it partly due to the highly beneficial ivy growing up it. The Woodland Trust advise that Ivy is no longer cleared because of its huge benefit to wildlife. The tree supports thousands of bees when it is in flower, many rare moths and butterflies, nesting and roosting birds, and it has become an important roost for starlings. Most importantly, bats have been seen coming and going over the last two years, a thorough survey should be carried out regarding this before any work is attempted. I have taken advice from an independent ecologist who has said it is likely that bats are present.

The garden the tree stands in was registered 25 years ago with the Royal Society for Nature Conservation as a wildlife garden. If the crown were to be raised the long established understory of shade loving British native wild flowers such as bluebells, bladder campion, lesser periwinkle and native ferns etc would be destroyed along with the habitat for wood mice, voles and hedgehogs and ultimately the owls that visit in autumn and winter.

As it is not clear on the planning application, I would like to know which driveway needs clearance of 4 metres. I keep my vintage VW Camper on the drive directly under the tree and have never damaged my VW which has also been here 30 years. The neighbour that requested these works' phone lines are not affected by the branches and the two that could be, numbers 5 and 3, do not support this application. The tree has a TPO on it for a reason, it is an asset to the community and has grown into a very good shape, unnecessary removal of branches would spoil it aesthetically and possibly lead to disease.

I strongly disagree with this application and believe the work is unnecessary, unwanted and a waste of the landlords' resources and goes against their policies to only carry out work on trees that are dead, diseased or dying. I believe that this application was made by the neighbour because I asked if they had planning permission when building their drive over the roots of the tree as I had to use specialist matting and root protection geocell to ensure there was no damage to the roots and water was not restricted to them and that the ph. Of any substrate used would not leach into the roots and damage them. I was trying to protect the tree and the neighbour from a fine but that does not seem to have gone down well.

I am happy to provide photos to support my objections.

Chair's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Clerk's Signature: _____ Date: _____