

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee  
held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke  
commencing at 7.00pm on 22 October 2019**

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

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

**Public Attendance:** 20 members of the public were present

**PLAN\_1920\_M11/**

**Public Session**

Cllr Brown welcomed everyone to the meeting and confirmed everyone was present to comment on application F/19/86348. Cllr Brown informed residents that the Parish Council is merely a statutory consultee and does not make any decisions regarding planning. Cllr Brown also informed those present that the application would be considered by the Local Area Committee. This would take place at one of their next two meetings. They are on the 20<sup>th</sup> November and 29<sup>th</sup> January and take place at 7:00pm at Bishopstoke Methodist Church.

**106 Apologies for Absence**

106.1 Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Greenwood.

**107 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 8 October 2019**

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

107.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 8 October 2019 be accepted as a true record.

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

108.1 There were no matters arising from the minutes.

**109 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations**

109.1 There were no declarations or requests.

**110 Consideration of Planning Applications**

*Cllr Brown proposed that discussion of application F/19/86348 be brought forward at this point and the Committee voted to accept this.*

110.1 F/19/86348 – 58-64 Stoke Common Road – Construction of 10No. three bedroom semi-detached dwellings, 2 No. 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 – Cllr Brown asked Cllr Francis to read through her proposed response to the

application. The proposed response is attached to the minutes as Appendix A. Following that, the Chair asked for comments from the floor. Objections to the current and proposed developments included: inconsiderate parking by developers causing a hazard for residents attempting to enter or exit driveways, Wilmot Close and Pendula Way due to being unable to see oncoming traffic; the small proposed parking spaces for the new development and the small gaps between dwellings; littering by contractors; the steep slopes potentially leading to erosion of existing gardens; potential harm caused to local bat colonies and badger sets and the lack of social or affordable housing. Cllr Francis also informed those present that the Chair of the Stoke Common Resident's Association had written in objection to the application. Cllr Francis passed a copy of the letter to the Clerk for the benefit of the Committee. Cllr Toher stated that this application constitutes overdevelopment; that there would need to be a construction traffic management plan; that the Parish Council had concerns over the impact to the allotments at Jockey Lane and that in the absence of a bus route, adding this many dwellings, and therefore cars, to the roads was not in keeping with the Borough having recently declared a Climate Change Emergency. Cllr Toher also stated that this area of Bishopstoke has been identified as in need of low-cost housing and this proposed development did not provide that. The Committee agreed to use Cllr Francis's proposed response as the base, with the Clerk to include the various points raised by residents and then circulate a full draft objection to Committee members the following day.

**Action: Clerk**

*Clerk's note: The decision to hold an extra Planning Committee meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> October meant that the draft objection could be considered at that meeting and so there was no longer a time-limited need to circulate it. It will be included in the document pack for the meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> October.*

110.2 H/19/86526 – 21 Mitre Copse – Single storey side extension – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application.

110.3 H/19/86531 – 61A Hamilton Road – First floor extension, new entrance door and single storey side extension to detached garage with roller door – The Committee thought that this application needed discussion. As the remaining business on the agenda was substantial and the allotted time for the meeting had already passed, the Committee agreed to add a meeting on October 29<sup>th</sup>, and to defer this application to that meeting.

**Action: Clerk**

110.4 H/19/85859 – 319 Fair Oak Road – Formation of drop kerb to enable use of driveway – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to this application.

110.5 H/19/86593 – 6 Edward Avenue – Single storey side extension – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to this application.

110.6 Consideration of planning applications that arrived after the publication of this agenda – The Committee agreed to defer the four applications that had arrived after the publication of the agenda to the meeting on October 29<sup>th</sup>. These applications were:

H/19/86614 – 32 Hartley Road - Two and single storey rear extension, dormers to side elevations and rooflights to the South roof slope;

T/19/86592 – 1 Longmead Avenue - 1 group of Leylandii (G1) - reduce in height by 50% to manage these better for the future;

T/19/86563 – Friarmayne - 1 no Ash - cut back lowest limb over property by 2-3 metres to clear the property. 1 no. Pine - reduce branches growing into the Cedar by up to 2 metres;

NC/19/86628 – 109 Spring Lane – Notification of intent: 1 Holm Oak, fell

**Action: Clerk**

## 111 Report on recent planning decisions

111.1 H/19/86107 – 27 Beaver Drive – Two storey side and single storey rear extension – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application – The Borough Council permitted the application.

111.2 NC/19/86356 – Friarmayne, Church Road – Notification of intent: 1 no. Cherry (T1) – Fell; 1 no. Fir Tree (T3) – Fell; 1 no. Holly (T4) – Fell; 1 no. Ash (T5) – Fell; 1 no. Pine (T6) - Reduce branches by 3-4 metres to give clearance from the Blue Atlas Cedar; T7 and T8 - 2 smaller Firs - Fell. Group of mixed bushes and trees (TB1) along boundary – Remove; Group of mixed trees (TB2) Reduce by 0.5 - 1 metre; TB3 Laurel and a Strawberry tree reduce by 2 metres in width TB4 Leylandii - Reduce by 4 metres in height works – The Committee requested that suitable trees be replanted to replace those that are being felled, and that there be a commitment that should those new trees die during their first five years they be replaced again. The Committee also requested that the Borough Council Tree Officer visit the site and provide an assurance that it is necessary to fell the trees – The Borough Council raised no objection to the works. The tree officer’s report is attached to these minutes as Appendix B.

111.3 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 - the Borough Council raised no objection to the application.

111.4 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 – The Borough Council consented to the application.

## 112 Clerk’s Report

112.1 Actions from previous meetings:

Minute 100.7 The Clerk reported that the missing notification from the Borough had arrived the day after the Planning Committee meeting.

Minute 102.1 The Clerk reported that he had had no further reply from the Environment Agency.

Minute 105.2 The Clerk noted that this would be covered in confidential business.

112.2 The Clerk informed the Committee that following the Committee’s request that the Borough require new planting to replace felled trees as part of application NC/19/86356, the Borough had replied stating that as this was a Conservation Area request they were not able to condition the planting of new trees unlike with a TPO. The Tree Officer report for the application is attached to these minutes as Appendix B.

## 113 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting

113.1 The next regular meeting will be on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> November 2019, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications. There will be an additional meeting on Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> October 2019 at 7:00pm in the Parish Office.

103.2 Any agenda items for the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019.

## 114 Motion for Confidential Business

114.1 The Committee agreed to defer this item until the meeting on October 29<sup>th</sup>..

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.37pm*

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

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

**Planning Application: F/19/86348 56-64 Stoke Common Road Bishopstoke.**

**OBJECTION**

In response to the above submission I wish to lodge my objection for the following reasons.

- Poor layout negatively impacting the residential amenity of occupiers as a result of overlooking and poor outlook.
- A negative and urbanising impact on the Stoke Common Road Frontage as a result of a net loss of landscape and the visual intrusion of poorly screened car parking.
- Under provision of private amenity space which does not meet the Councils minimum standards as set out in the adopted Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document.
- An absence of information in relation to surface water management particularly important in this location in view of the site's proximity to the River Itchen SAC.
- House design does not meet the design requirements of NPPF 2, having a functional and dull appearance of "anywhere housing" lacking either a clear architectural language or assessment of the vernacular.

**Additional Points**

- Whilst it is stated that the consultation period ended on the 25/10/19 a site notice did not appear until xyz reducing the time for residents to give their view.
- The site abuts the Eastern edge of the Jockey Lane Allotments (a Parish Council Asset). Along this boundary is a slope (falling West to East) with a dense tree belt towards the top. This is a significant landscape feature providing visual separation between the allotments and the residential properties on Stoke Common Road. The submitted material is silent on the future of this tree belt.
- The design and access statement is weak and provides an inadequate assessment of the sites context.

**INTRODUCTION**

It is accepted that the principle of re-development of this land for housing is not contrary to National Policy or Eastleigh Borough Councils adopted policies. However, the Parish Planning Committee in its responses to Eastleigh Borough Council seeks to encourage good design and sustainable development to improve the environment of the village.

At National level the NPPF (as amended) the Councils own adopted policies and adopted supplementary planning documents provide guidance to ensure a high standard of design and Layout.

### **Poor Scheme Layout and residential amenity for occupiers**

At page 38 the NPPF 2019 States that “The creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve” This proposal fails at a number of levels to deliver this requirement. As the council has a housing land supply well in excess of 5 years there is no requirement to consider development at a higher density.

The front to back relationship with plots 13-16 facing the rears of the properties facing Stoke Common Road constitutes is poor urban design and results in 2 major design problems with the layout.

1. Plots 13-16 principle outlook will be onto the rear boundary (expected to be a solid 1.8m) of the properties to the East providing a restricted outlook and very functional and unattractive shared space.
2. As a result of the above arrangement the principle (Eastern) outlook of plots 13-15 face the private amenity space potentially resulting in overlooking which would be exacerbated if occupiers subsequently added front dormers/roof lights under permitted development. The adopted QPSPD at p.32 states that “rear privacy can be best assured by arranging garden boundaries back to back and not adjoin public space”.
3. The submitted Design and Access statement states that the separation distance is 19m between plots 13-19 and Plots 9-12 which is less than the adopted QPSPD minimum back to back distance of 22m (p32).
4. Whilst all units appear to have rear gardens below the standard depth set out in the QPSPD (12M) (unable to check due to being unable to access scale drawings) but should be checked by case officer.
5. As a result of the steeply rising land to the West, plots 13-16 appear to have very little useable amenity space. The QPSPD (p.29) states “private outdoor space must be directly physically accessible for all physical abilities”.

### **Absence of information Sustainable Urban Drainage**

1. The site is located within the catchment of the River Itchen SAC. As the proposal will significantly increase the area of hard surfacing, measures to manage surface water during storm events need to be constructed to accommodate 3 forms of filtration to ensure a high standard of water quality reaching the river and its valley which has a European level of protection.

### **Urbanising effect on the on the Stoke Common Road Frontage**

- 1) The current site frontage to Stoke Common Road comprises low brick walls, well established landscape with bungalows set back enabling parking to be partially screened. Whilst the building line of the proposal reflects the existing, the tandem parking proposed will be visually obtrusive

in the street scene. This is contrary to the guidance set out in the Character Area Appraisal (SPD Adopted 2008 p.16) guidance which states “maintain the predominant setbacks in order to retain/re-enforce the existing levels of on-plot planting”.

- 2) Whilst landscape strips are shown they are vulnerable to trampling or paving over by residents. Indicative trees are shown on the frontage, the detail of tree pit specification and species will be required and are absent.

### **House Design**

- 1) The National Planning Policy Framework at Chapter 12 “Achieving Well Designed Places” states at paragraph 130 “Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area”.
- 2) The Design and Access Statement fails to undertake assessment of context as required by adopted policy 59BE in the adopted 2001-11 local plan, this should include an assessment of local townscape and vernacular design. As a result of this lack of assessment the units shown are architecturally dull and a standard product with no local cues or references.

## Eastleigh Borough Council Preservation Order and Conservation Area Application Assessment Form

<b>Application Number</b>	NC/19/86356							
<b>Case Officer</b>	Chris Stringer							
<b>Site assessment Date</b>	23/09/2019							
<b>Address</b>	FRIARMAYNE, CHURCH ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 6BH							
<b>Work notification/ request</b>	<p>Notification of intent:</p> <p>1 no. Cherry (T1) - Fell.</p> <p>1 no. Fir Tree (T3) - Fell.</p> <p>1 no. Holly (T4) - Fell.</p> <p>1 no. Ash (T5) - Fell.</p> <p>T7 and T8 - 2 smaller Firs - Fell.</p> <p>Group of mixed bushes and trees (TB1) along boundary - Remove.</p> <p>Group of mixed trees (TB2) Reduce by 0.5 - 1 metre.</p> <p>TB3 Laurel and a Strawberry tree reduce by 2 metres in width.</p> <p>TB4 Leylandii - Reduce by 4 metres in height.</p>							
<b>Comments/ observations following site visit</b>	<p>T1 is a small cherry. The tree cannot easily be seen from the public realm and does not, therefore, provide significant amenity.</p> <p>T3 is a medium sized conifer, with significant structural issues. The tree cannot be seen from the public realm and does not, therefore, provide significant amenity.</p> <p>T4 is a small specimen. The tree cannot easily be seen from the public realm and does not, therefore, provide significant amenity.</p> <p>T5 is a small specimen. The tree cannot easily be seen from the public realm and does not, therefore, provide significant amenity.</p> <p>T7 and T8 are young specimens. The trees cannot be seen from the public realm and do not, therefore, provide significant amenity.</p> <p>The proposed work to TB1, TB2, TB3 and TB4 are probably not covered under conservation area legislation (due to being predominately shrubs and bushes), but even where small trees do occur, they are not of significant size and cannot be seen from the public realm.</p>							
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Consent</b>	<b>Refuse</b>	<b>Part consent/ Part refuse</b>	<b>Withdrawn / Invalid</b>	<b>Conservation Area</b>			
					<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Raise no objection</td> <td style="text-align: center;">TPO</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">*</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Raise no objection	TPO	*
Raise no objection	TPO							
*								
<b>Decision notice</b>	<p>Raise no objection to:</p> <p>1 no. Cherry (T1) - Fell.</p> <p>1 no. Fir Tree (T3) - Fell.</p> <p>1 no. Holly (T4) - Fell.</p> <p>1 no. Ash (T5) - Fell.</p> <p>T7 and T8 - 2 smaller Firs - Fell.</p> <p>Group of mixed bushes and trees (TB1) along boundary - Remove.</p>							

	<p>Group of mixed trees (TB2) Reduce by 0.5 - 1 metre.          TB3 Laurel and a Strawberry tree reduce by 2 metres in width.          TB4 Leylandii - Reduce by 4 metres in height.</p>		
<b>Conditions</b>	n/a		
<b>Notes to applicant</b>	None		
<b>Parish comments</b>	<p>Bishopstoke Parish Council Planning Committee requested that suitable trees be replanted to replace those that are being felled, and that there be a commitment that should those new trees die during their first five years they be replaced again. The Committee also requested that the Borough Council Tree Officer visit the site and provide an assurance that it is necessary to fell the trees.</p>		
<b>Public objection/ support</b>	Support	Objection	Observation
	0	0	0
<b>Objection/ support consideration</b>	<p>Conservation Area legislation does not allow us to condition replanting or aftercare (unlike TPO legislation).</p> <p>The committee should be made aware that a tree officer will always carry out a site visit.</p>		