

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee  
held at Bishopstoke Methodist Church  
commencing at 7:00pm on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2025**

**Present:** Cllrs Hillier-Wheal (Chair – Standing Orders 1.16), Daly and Toher

**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\_2526\_M11/**

**Public Session**

**77 Apologies for Absence**

77.1 Apologies were received from Cllrs Mignot and Moore

**78 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2025**

78.1 The minutes of the above meeting were included with the supporting papers for this meeting.

78.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Daly, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2025 be adopted as a true record.

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

**79 Declarations of interest and requests for dispensation**

79.1 No declarations of interest or requests for dispensation were made.

**80 Consideration of Planning Applications**

80.1 H/25/100337 – 18 Orchard Avenue – Loft conversion with hip to cropped gables, rear dormer, single storey rear extension and Log Burner Flue. The Committee agreed to raise no objection to this planning application but would like to comment that log burners are not considered to be environmentally friendly.

80.2 F/25/100284 – 6 Sedgwick Road – Proposed erection of 1 x detached 3-bedroom bungalow. The Committee agreed to object to this planning application for the following reasons:

1. The reduction in footprint that results from the application changing from two semi-detached bungalows to a single bungalow does mean that there is an increase in the area to be retained as grass. However, as the new plan is for a three-bed bungalow and therefore has three parking spaces it is not as significant a reduction in hard standing as it could be.
2. The proposed dwelling still suffers from lack of light. The garden area to the north would be shadowed by the dwelling and the garden to the south by the existing flats at Sedgwick Court. The small section of garden to the west of the proposed dwelling would benefit from the most light, but the 1.8m boundary fence would limit this benefit.
3. The additional grassed area to the west of the dwelling does reduce the impact on the Root Protection Area (RPA), but not by much. The proportion of RPA covered by new hard standing remains excessive and at the time of commenting there is no documentation provided to justify either the positioning of the RPA or the level of retained grassed area.
4. The Ecology Officer in responding to the previous application stated that “soakaways must not be located in the root protection zone of any trees”. There are two new proposed soakaways shown on the plans, one of which contravenes this requirement. Additionally, there is still no soil permeability data provided and so the question of whether the site is suitable for infiltration remains.
5. As yet there is no submitted updated ecology information or a recalculated Small Sites Metric Calculation despite the change to retained grassed area. Therefore it is presumed that the same problems exist with the site as before – no new habitats are being created and all existing habitats destroyed, with the applicant relying on the purchasing of credits for mitigation.
6. Finally, no mitigation has been provided for the impact on the New Forest Special Protection Area or the River Itchen Special Protection Area, with no contribution being made to the former and only a stated intent to buy credits for nutrition mitigation for the latter.

80.3 H/25/100325 – 36 Church Road – Replace wooden windows with Black upvc Flush Casement Fittings consistent with existing format and detailing. The Committee agreed to raise no objections to his planning application.

80.4 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Daly, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the responses of the Planning Committee be submitted as minuted above.

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

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

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

## **82 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

82.1 The next meeting of the Planning Committee will take place on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> December at 7:00pm at Bishopstoke Methodist Church. The Clerk reminded Cllrs that any agenda items should be provided, with any supporting papers, to the Clerk by Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> December.

**83 Motion for confidential business**

83.1 Proposed Cllr Hillier-Wheal, 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.

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

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

84.2 Cllrs raised a concern regarding an alleged unauthorised sign and the Clerk was asked to follow this up.

**Action: Clerk – To take a photo of the sign and contact the planning authority.**

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7:19 pm*

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

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