

# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 11 April 2017

**Present:** Cllrs Thornton (Vice-Chair), Brown, Dean, Francis and Greenwood

**In Attendance:** Mr D Hillier-Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)  
Cllr Parker-Jones  
Borough Cllr Parkinson-MacLachlan

**Public Session** 3 members of the public were present (1 from minute 5.4)

**PLAN\_1718\_M01/**

### Public Session

A resident asked it would be possible, at the point where the motion for confidential business is being proposed, to ask first whether there is any need for the motion, in order to avoid members of the public having to leave the room unnecessarily. The Clerk was asked to seek guidance on the procedure.

**Action: Clerk**

### 1. Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies had been received and were accepted from Cllr Toher.

### 2. To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 28 March 2017

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

2.2 Proposed Cllr Greenwood, Seconded Cllr Francis, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 28 March 2017 be accepted as a true record.

### 3. To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

3.1 Minute PLAN\_1617\_M21/215.3 – The Clerk had made the request to the Borough but had not yet received a reply.

### 4. Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

4.1 Cllr Brown declared an interest in application F/17/80122, as a friend of the resident.

### 5. Consideration of Planning Applications

5.1 A/17/80137 – River Inn, 2 Fair Oak Road – Display of 2no. internally illuminated fascia signs, 2no. internally illuminated totem signs and 2no. internally illuminated free standing signs – The Committee agreed to object on the grounds of light pollution in the conservation area.

5.2 F/17/80122 – 3 Squirrel Close – Addition of pitched roof to existing garage and side extension – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application.

5.3 F/17/80184 – 48 Whalesmead Road – Single storey rear extension – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

5.4 F/17/80188 – Land to rear of 86 Edward Avenue - Erection of 10 No. dwellings, 8 No. three bed and 2 No. 4 bed houses with vehicular access, parking, landscaping and refuse storage – Cllr Parker-Jones reported on a number of concerns raised by residents, as did Cllr Francis. Cllr Thornton stated that back gardens can be regarded as brownfield sites for planning, and so it may be more difficult to object successfully. The Committee agreed to object on the grounds of: overdevelopment; properties overlooking each other, and existing dwellings; the size and location of plot 5 not being suitable; damage to TPO trees; proximity to the Cemetery; the height of the proposed dwellings – it being felt that if any dwellings are to be built they should be in keeping with Rogers Road rather than Edwards Avenue; the access to Edward Avenue – the proposals would lead to three roads joining Edward Avenue on the same bend which poses a risk to safety; the likelihood of asbestos sheds having been buried in the ground some years ago and that 10 dwellings is too many to squeeze on a plot that size. The Committee also questioned whether the Borough Council currently has enough enforcement officers to ensure any work is done correctly. It was also noted that there is no Flood Risk Assessment, which is a requirement of all developments of 10 dwellings or more. The Clerk was asked to report these concerns directly to the Case Officer and request that the decision be taken by the Local Area Committee, rather than delegated.

**Action: Clerk**

## **6. Report on recent planning decision**

6.1 F/17/79936 – 5 Jockey Lane – Revision to planning permission F/16/78619 comprising of amendment from 2no. 3 bed dwellings to 2no. four bed dwellings with associated parking and amenity space – The planning committee were unhappy with the concept of retrospectively revising an approved application for 3 bed dwellings into 4 bed dwellings. As the houses have already been built this appeared to the Committee to be an attempt to circumvent the planning procedure. The Committee also questioned why this had not been picked up by building control. Objections were raised on the grounds of overdevelopment and parking, as with 2 extra bedrooms but no extra parking this means there will be insufficient parking on site – Eastleigh Borough Council permitted the application

6.2 T/16/80006 – 2 Bishops Court – Fell 2no. Ash, crown raise to 4.5m 1no. Cherry & 1no. Tulip tree & crown reduction by 2.5m to 1no. Pear tree – The Planning Committee had no objection to the work on the Cherry, Tulip and Pear trees, but objected to the felling of the two Ash trees on the grounds that they were healthy TPO trees, and no satisfactory grounds for their removal has been provided.

Eastleigh Borough Council's decision was Partial Consent:

REFUSE CONSENT for the following: Pear [T5] reduction by 2.5m & crown raise to 4.5m 1no. Cherry tree. The proposed works are considered unjustified and will be of detriment to the health and appearance of the trees. The works would therefore result in an adverse impact upon the visual amenity, ecology, wildlife and screening of the surrounding area.

CONSENT TO: Ash (T1) - Fell. Replant 1 x tree details will need to be supplied prior to the tree being removed. Sycamore (T2) - Remove 3 lowest branches over garden. To allow more light into the garden and form the crown discouraging long low limbs. Cherry (T3) Remove lowest branch damaging fence and reduce second low branch by up to 2m from the branch tip, pruning to a suitable growth point. Ash (T4) - Fell. No replant. Pear (T5) Crown reduce by up to 1.5m from the longest branch tips, keeping pruning wounds below 75mm and maintain a natural shaped crown. Tulip (T6)- Raise crown up to 4.5m from ground level. (1) The tree works hereby consented shall be completed within 2 years of the date of this permission and shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and to British Standard for Tree Work BS3998:2010. Reason: To preserve the special amenity value of the trees.

6.3 T/16/80007 – 3 Bishops Court – Removal of lower limbs to 1no. Sycamore – The Committee agreed to RNO to the planning application - EBC Consented

6.4 F/17/80103 – 97 Underwood Road – Single storey side extension – The Planning Committee agreed to raise no objection to the planning application - EBC Permitted

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **.7. Consideration of proposed traffic regulation orders (TROs)**

7.1 Cllr Parker-Jones reported concerns from residents in general and Bishopstoke Players in particular. The usual response from residents has been that parking along Church Road needs changing, but that double yellow lines would not be appropriate. The most common suggestion is that there should be double yellow lines on the blind bend, and that the rest should be some form of limited waiting from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday.

7.2 Borough Cllr Parkinson-Maclachlan informed the Committee that the roads included on the Traffic Regulation Order consultation have all been regularly put forward by residents. The rules state that once an area has been put forward for consultation it cannot be increased, but it can be decreased, which is why the consultation covers such a wide area to start with. Now the Borough Council wants the response of residents to the proposals so that it can gauge how to amend them to best accommodate all concerns. All residents are encouraged to respond to the consultation.

7.3 The Committee agreed to respond to the consultation, stating that their preferred option was to have limited time waiting from 9am- 5pm on Monday – Friday along most of Church Road, and to have No Waiting At Any Time restrictions on the blind bend.

### **Action: Clerk**

7.4 The Clerk was asked to add this to the agenda again for further discussion. The Clerk stated that the consultation would be closed before the next meeting, but that it was anticipated that there may well be another opportunity to comment once amended proposals are put forward.

## **8. Clerk's Report**

8.1 The Clerk reported that planning application F/16/78907 regarding 35 Oakgrove Road had been appealed.

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

9.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 25 April 2017 at 7:00pm in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke. The office will be open from 6:45pm for viewing of the applications.

9.2 Any agenda items should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 17 April 2017.

## **10. Motion for Confidential Business**

10.1 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 is advisable in the public interest that the public be excluded and for the record the business be regarded as confidential.

## **11. Reported Breaches of Developmental Control (Confidential Business)**

11.1 The Clerk reported 0 new alleged breaches of development control.

11.2 The Clerk reported 0 concluded investigations into alleged breaches of development control.

11.3 There were no reported development control issues from members of the Committee.

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.32pm*