

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee
held online commencing at 7.00pm on 14 July 2020**

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

In Attendance: Mr D Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)
Cllr Harris (Bishopstoke Parish Council)
Mrs S Thorogood (RFO)

Public Attendance: 0 members of the public were present

PLAN_2021_M01/

Public Session

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies had been received and were accepted from Cllrs Francis and Greenwood.

2 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10 March 2020

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

2.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10 March 2020 be adopted as a true record.

2.3 The Clerk was requested to forward any reply from the Borough Council on the question of it deciding on its own applications to the Committee, and if there had not been one, to chase it.

Action: Clerk

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

3.1 There were no matters arising.

4 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

4.1 There were no declarations or requests.

5 Consideration of Planning Applications

5.1 NC/20/87992 – Manor Cottage, Church Road – 2 no. Holm Oak (T1 & T2) - reduce height by 2 metres and lateral branches by 2 metres – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application.

5.2 F/19/86707 – Southampton International Airport – Construction of a 164 metre runway extension at the northern end of the existing runway, associated blast screen to the north of the proposed runway extension, removal of existing bund and the reconfiguration and extension of existing long stay car parking to the east and west of Mitchell Way to provide additional long stay spaces (Amended Description) This application is subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The Clerk noted that the obvious difference between the two applications was that the initial application had specified an additional 600 spaces for long term parking, whereas the new application simply mentions “additional spaces” without providing a figure.

The objection raised by the Committee on the previous occasion this application was considered was:

“The Committee agreed to object to this application. Grounds for objection were the increased noise levels over Bishopstoke due to the longer, lower take off routes; the increased traffic levels along Southampton Road which already suffers from poor air quality and high pollution levels; the submitted Local Plan states that there is a need to address pollution from vehicle emissions and this airport expansion will only serve to increase traffic; the proposed route for traffic from the new road proposed in the submitted Local Plan is down Bishopstoke Lane and this will only increase that traffic; both the Borough Council and Bishopstoke Parish Council have declared a Climate Change Emergency – an airport expansion goes contrary to the aims stated by both Councils in terms of climate change; vehicle access to the airport is not sufficient to deal with the increase in traffic which will mean more delays and more pollution and finally there appear to be no plans to improve the existing road network – either national or local – to take account of the increase in traffic that would result from this expansion. Additionally, the Committee would like to see a carbon mitigation plan and a clarification of the proposed road going from one side of the airport to the other – especially with regard to how it fits in with any proposed Chickenhall Lane link road”

The Committee agreed to restate this objection in its entirety. The Committee also agreed to add a comment regretting the lack of commitment to a specific number of parking spaces and asking what the minimum number would be.

5.3 There were no late applications for this agenda.

6 Report on recent planning decisions

6.1 H/19/87049 – 22 Earls Close – Two storey side extension – No objection raised by the Planning Committee – The Borough Council permitted the application

6.2 H/20/87260 – 35 Nelson Road - Single storey rear extension and first floor front extension – No objection raised by the Planning Committee – The Borough Council permitted the application

6.3 H/20/87302 – 43 Oakgrove Road - Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and detached garage and alterations to fenestration – No objection raised by the Planning Committee – The Borough Council permitted the application

6.4 T/20/87504 – Glebe Meadow - 2 no. Ash (T1 and T2) - Reduce by 2-3m all round due to multiple branch failures and close proximity to built structures. 1 no. Ash (T3) - Reduce to a 1.2m Pollard due to significant decay and canopy dieback – No objection raised by the Planning Committee – The Borough Council consented to the application

6.5 H/20/87496 – 29 Weavills Road – Two Storey rear extension – No objection raised by the Planning Committee – The Borough Council permitted the application

6.6 H/20/87458 – 72 Stoke Common Road – Retrospective garage application – No objection raised by the Planning Committee – The Borough Council permitted the application

6.7 H/20/87594 – 19 Rogers Road - Loft conversion with hip to gable roof extension, rear facing dormer with balcony over single storey rear extension – No objection raised by the Planning Committee – The Borough Council permitted the application

6.8 T/20/87613 – St Marys – 3 no. Beech trees and 1 no. Chestnut - Permission is sought to remove roots of up to 25mm, as necessary, in order to repair the tarmac path Council application – This was not considered by the Planning Committee as the application was made by Bishopstoke Parish Council – The Borough Council consented to the application

Initial: _____ Date: _____

6.9 T/20/87431 – 1 Sydney Road - 1 no. Walnut tree - Crown reduction by 4 metres and crown thinning by 20%. Removal of 1 - 2 lower branches to shape and balance the tree – No objection raised by the Planning Committee – The Borough Council refused the 4m reduction and crown thinning. However, they consented to a reduction by 3m, no crown thinning and the removal of 1-2 lower branches

6.10 F/20/87298 – Land lying East of Spring Lane - Erection of single storey detached garage block – The Planning Committee had objected to this revised application and made the following comments. The application is nothing to do with 56 Spring Lane as per the drawings and is in fact “Land lying to the East of Spring Lane”. The Committee noted that the revised application had gone from 5 to 4 units, with the fourth unit being wider than the others, and felt concerned this would be used as storage. The Committee also noted that the drawings are not to scale. The Committee felt there is no documented link between houses mentioned in section 25 of the application form with relation to legal ownership of the garages and commented that they are not an agricultural tenant – Permit with conditions - The garages hereby approved shall only be used for the purposes of parking private motor vehicles and domestic storage and shall not, at any time, be used for living accommodation, business, commercial or industrial purposes – The Borough Council permitted the application on the conditions that: “The garages hereby approved shall only be used for the purposes of parking private motor vehicles and domestic storage and shall not, at any time, be used for living accommodation, business, commercial or industrial purposes, Reason: To limit the impact the development has on the amenity of the locality; No vehicles shall be parked to the front of the garage block at any time, unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interest of access and highway safety”

6.11 T/20/87368 – 4 Manor Farm Grove - Group of Macrocarpa and Lawson Cypress - Remove all current coniferous species on site and replant with a more appropriate species hedge along the southern and western boundary fence-line – The Committee noted that the Macrocarpa and Lawson Cypress are all protected by TPO and do not appear to be diseased, unhealthy, dying or a danger to life or property and therefore the Committee agreed to object to the planning application on those grounds – The Borough Council consented to the application

6.12 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 Committee agreed to object on the grounds that there is no provision for affordable / social housing; there has been no significant change to the design of the properties so they are still not in keeping with the local area; there is an unmet requirement for visitor parking; this development would mean the loss of several bungalows for the elderly with no similar new provision and as there is still no public transport in the area the significant increase in traffic movements in an already hazardous location will prove dangerous – The Borough Council permitted the application

7 Clerk’s Report

7.1 The Clerk informed the Committee that during lockdown there had been five planning applications that had not been considered by the planning committee. These were:

H/20/87492 – 27 Whalesmead Road – Two storey rear extension – Permitted by the Borough Council

F/20/87614 – 69-73 Bishopstoke Road - Addition of first floor office within new pitched roof to include 3no. front and 2no. rear dormers – Permitted by the Borough Council

T/20/87824 – 5 Sydney Road - 1 no. birch (T1) - Crown lift to 4 metres, crown reduce by 2 metres and crown thin by 25%. 2 no. Norwegian spruce (T2 & T3) - Crown reduce by 2 metres and crown thin by 25%. – Consented to by the Borough Council

H/20/87815 – 13 The Spinney – Two storey rear extension – Permitted by the Borough Council

H/20/87937 – 2 Whalesmead Road – Single storey side extension – As yet undecided

Initial: _____ Date: _____

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

8.1 The next regular meeting will be on Tuesday 28th July 2020, at 7:00pm and will be held online.

8.2 Any agenda items for the meeting should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 20th July 2020.

9 Motion for Confidential Business

9.1 The Clerk informed the Committee that the report on enforcement matters would be presented at the next meeting. No motion for confidential business was therefore required.

10 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential Business)

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

10.2 The Clerk reported no concluded breaches of Development Control.

10.3 Cllrs reported no additional items of confidential business

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.28pm

Chair's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Clerk's Signature: _____ Date: _____