

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee
held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke
commencing at 7.00pm on 29 October 2019**

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

In Attendance: Mrs C Taylor (Assistant Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)
Cllr Parker-Jones

Public Attendance: 0 members of the public were present

PLAN_1920_M12/

Public Session

115 Apologies for Absence

115.1 All Councillors were present.

116 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 October 2019

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

116.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 October 2019 be accepted as a true record.

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

117.1 There were no matters arising from the minutes.

118 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

118.1 There were no declarations or requests.

119 Consideration of Planning Applications

119.1 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 agreed to Object to this application for the following reasons - the drawing states that the property is 61 but the application form states that the property is 61A, therefore there is confusion over exactly what is planned. If the application is for an existing 61A dwelling, assuming that has been approved in the past, then there is limited amenity space for a 2 bedroom dwelling and the detail on the garage is unclear given that there is already a garage on site. If the garage is to be increased in size then that would further decrease the parking and amenity space. If the application is for property 61 then there is limited amenity space available for both dwellings and it is not in keeping with the street scene. The Committee would query if this consultation is valid.

119.2 H/19/86614 – 32 Hartley Road – Two and single storey rear extension, dormers to side elevations and rooflights to the South roof slope - the Committee agreed to Raise No Objection but wished to comment that the description of the work given is different to that on the application form.

119.3 Cllr Brown requested that at the November planning meeting that the Committee should discuss making comments to Eastleigh Borough Council concerning the need for the correct details to be given on planning information.

Action: Clerk

119.4 T/19/86592 – 1 Longmead Avenue - 1 group of Leylandii (G1) - reduce in height by 50% to manage these better for the future – the Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application but queried the need for the application, as their understanding is that an application is not required for Leylandii. The Committee also wished to comment that work on the silver birch is not mentioned on the council descriptor, so they haven't commented on it, but that it is mentioned on the application form.

119.5 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 - the Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application.

119.6 NC/19/86228 – 109 Spring Lane – Notification of intent: 1 Holm Oak, fell - the Committee agreed to request a Tree Preservation Order be placed on the tree, or, if Eastleigh Borough Council is minded to permit, to request that another tree be planted. The reasons for their decision include that there is no report on the tree, that 'nuisance' is not a reason to fell, that the tree is not diseased, nor is there damage to property. The Committee instead suggest tree management.

119.7 There were no late applications for this agenda.

120 To confirm the text of the objection to Planning Application F/19/86348

120.1 Cllr Francis stated that the Clerk had incorporated the residents' comments very well into the proposed text. The Committee agreed to confirm the text of the objection, subject to one small change to the text, which was the addition of '(2019)' to be inserted after the word 'Framework' in the objection point beginning 'House design does not meet the design requirements of National Planning Policy Framework...'.

121 Report on recent planning decisions

121.1 None to report on.

122 Clerk's Report

122.1 Actions from previous meetings:

Minute 110.1 The full text of the suggested response to F/19/86348 was circulated and subsequently discussed at this meeting.

Minute 110.3 The discussion of application H/19/86531 was placed on this agenda.

Minute 110.6 The discussion of the late applications was placed on this agenda.

122.2 The Assistant Clerk informed the Committee that there was nothing further to report.

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

123.1 The next regular meeting will be on Tuesday 12th November 2019, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications.

123.2 Any agenda items for the meeting should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 4th November 2019.

Initial: _____ Date: _____

124 Motion for Confidential Business

124.1 Proposed Cllr Brown, Seconded Cllr Greenwood, **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.

125 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential Business)

125.1 The Clerk reported two new alleged breaches of Development Control.

125.2 The Clerk reported one concluded breach of Development Control.

125.3 Cllrs reported no additional items of confidential business

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.42pm

Chair's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Clerk's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Re: Planning Application F/19/86348 – 58-64 Stoke Common Road

Bishopstoke Parish Council wishes to strongly object to the proposed development at 58-64 Stoke Common Road. The main reasons are detailed immediately below, followed by a more detailed explanation of some of the key points. It is accepted that the principal of re-development of this particular space for housing is not contrary to either National Policy or Eastleigh Borough Council's adopted policies. However, the Parish Council Planning Committee seeks to encourage good design and sustainable development to improve the environment of the village through its responses to the Planning Authority. Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework, the Borough Council's own adopted policies and the various adopted supplementary planning documents provide guidance to ensure a high standard of design and layout.

Main points for objection:

- The poor layout will negatively impact the residential amenity of occupiers as a result of both overlooking and poor outlook.
- There will be 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.
- There is under provision of private amenity space which does not meet the Borough Council's minimum standards as set out in the adopted Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document.
- There is an absence of information in relation to surface water management which is particularly important in this location in view of the site's proximity to the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation.
- House design does not meet the design requirements of National Planning Policy Framework (2019) Section 12 (Achieving Well Designed Places), having a functional and dull appearance of "anywhere housing" and lacking either a clear architectural language or an assessment of the vernacular.
- The site abuts the Eastern edge of the Jockey Lane allotments, owned by Bishopstoke Parish Council. There is a significant slope on this boundary falling down from the allotments with a dense tree belt at the top. This significant landscape feature provides visual separation between the allotments and the residential properties on Stoke Common Road and affords a degree a privacy. The current submitted plans for the development do not address the future of this tree belt.
- The design and access statement is weak and provides an inadequate assessment of the context of the site.
- Local wildlife would be severely impacted by this development. Bats and badgers are both known to inhabit the local environs and such major disruption to the local land and treescape would negatively affect both populations.
- Parking is already difficult in that area. Both Wilmot Close and Pendula Way opposite join Stoke Common Road virtually on the bend and there is currently a problem with vehicles using Stoke Common Road as a "rat run" to avoid traffic. Vehicles travel at significant speeds along this road and the addition of 16 dwellings and all the associated new traffic

movements can only exacerbate the situation. Additionally, the proposed parking for the new dwellings is inadequate in and of itself. During construction it is also difficult to see how any Traffic Management Plan could do anything to mitigate the increased danger to residents that would be caused by all the extra vehicle movements.

- National Planning Policy Framework Section 2, para 7 states “The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. This development does nothing to meet the needs of future generations in the area as it fails to take into account either the local street scene or the already identified need in the area for low cost, social or affordable housing. It fails to meet the most basic test of Sustainable Development.
- The submitted plans clearly represent over-development of the site. The housing density is significantly higher than that proposed in Eastleigh’s Local Plan let alone the surrounding neighbourhood. The gaps between dwellings are inadequate as is the parking space.
- Eastleigh Borough Council currently has a housing supply well in excess of 5 years so there is no need to consider this abnormally high density for a development.

Poor scheme layout and residential amenity for occupiers

The National Planning Policy Framework, Section 12, paragraph 124 states that “The creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.” This proposal fails to deliver this requirement on a number of levels:

- The principle outlook of plots 13-16 will be onto the rear boundary – expected to be a solid 1.8m – of the properties to the East and will provide a restricted outlook and very functional and unattractive shared space.
- The principle Eastern outlook of plots 13-15 faces the private amenity space, potentially resulting in overlooking which would be exacerbated if occupiers subsequently added front dormers or roof lights under permitted development. This is contrary to the adopted Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document which states (on page 32) that “rear privacy can best be assured by arranging garden boundaries back to back and not adjoining a public space.”
- The submitted Design and Access statement indicates that the separation distance is 19m between plots 13-15 and 9-12. Whereas the adopted Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document has a minimum back to back distance for new build dwellings of 20m (diagram on page 32).
- The rear gardens all appear to be shorter than the standard length of 12m set out in the adopted Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document.
- As a result of the steeply rising land to the West, plots 13-16 appear to have very little useable amenity space. The adopted Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document states (on page 29) that “The private outdoor space must be directly physically accessible for all physical abilities”.

Absence of information regarding Sustainable Urban Drainage

- The site is located within the catchment of the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation. As the proposal will significantly increase the area of hard surfacing, measures to manage surface water during storm events will need to be constructed. This should encompass three distinct forms of filtration to ensure a high standard of water quality reaching the river and its valley which has a European level of protection. There is currently no information on this.

Urbanising effect on the Stoke Common Road frontage

- The current site frontage to Stoke Common Road comprises low brick walls. It is a 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 (Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath) Supplementary Planning Document (adopted January 2008) which states (on page 16), with regard to this section of Stoke Common Road and Wilmot Close, that new development should “Maintain the predominant deep building setbacks in order to retain / reinforce the existing levels of on-plot planting.”.
- Whilst landscape strips are shown, they are vulnerable to trampling or paving over by residents. Indicative trees are shown on the frontage however the detail of tree pit specification and species are both absent and will be required.

House Design

- The National Planning Policy Framework, Section 12, paragraph 130 states “Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area”. This development places too many featureless dwellings in a cramped space, providing less separation, amenity space or privacy than is required, and does so whilst simultaneously going against guidance meant to preserve the character of the area. It is clear that this poor design will do nothing to enhance the area and so it should be refused.
- The Design and Access Statement fails to undertake an assessment of context as required by adopted policy 59BE in the adopted Local Plan (2001-2011). The Policy states that

“59.BE Development proposals which are in accordance with the other policies in this plan will be permitted provided they meet all the following criteria:

- i. they take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood and are appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views, natural features and trees worthy of retention;”

It is clear that even if an assessment of the context of the site has been done, it has not been taken account of when producing the Design and Access statement: The character, appearance, density, design and siting of the proposed development are all not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed development fails on design, sustainability, ecology, outlook, amenity space, parking and various other areas. It goes against established National and Local policy and guidance. It is poor in many respects and therefore it should be refused.