

# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 26 July 2016

**Present:** Cllrs Toher (Chair), Greenwood, Dean, and Francis. Also present Cllr Mignot.

**In Attendance:** Mr D Hillier-Wheal

**Public Session** 3 members of the public were present

### PLAN\_1617\_M07/

#### 67. Apologies for Absence

67.1 Cllr Brown (prior meeting) and Cllr Thornton

#### 68. To adopt, as a true record, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 12 July 2016

58.1 Proposed Cllr Greenwood, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 12 July be accepted as a true record.

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

69.1 Cllr Toher requested that in future, when all members are present, the minutes for apologies should read "All present", rather than "None received".

#### Action: Clerk

69.2 Item 59.2 The Clerk confirmed that the only Local Plan document missing was the original plan that ended in 2011.

69.3 Item 59.3 The Clerk reported that the TPO list has now been forwarded to all Committee members.

69.4 Item 59.3 Cllr Francis reported that she had been in touch with the Borough Council who said that matter of 5 Jockey Lane had been deferred so that a clear way forward could be found. Cllr Mignot advised that he believed it would be discussed at the next Local Area Committee meeting on 21 September. The Clerk was asked to check whether it would then be resubmitted and if the Parish Council would be asked to look at it again.

#### Action: Clerk

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

70.1 None declared or sought.

#### 71. Consideration of Planning Applications

71.1 F/16/78775 – 3 Rogers Close – Single storey extension to rear including attached garage & hobby room. A member of the public – Mr Grist – spoke at this point. He explained that he and his wife were the owners of the property and that following the recent birth of their second child they simply wished to make it a suitable family home, and to remove the asbestos lined garage and replace it - RNO

*2 members of the public left at this point, and 5 more arrived.*

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

71.2 F/16/78843 – 73 Stoke Park Road – Construction of single storey rear extension and detached garage, following removal of existing rear extension and garage – RNO. The Clerk was asked, as there is an attached CIL report, whether the Parish would receive any money. The Clerk was also asked to try and obtain a CIL briefing document.

**Action: Clerk**

71.3 F/16/78860 – 167 Underwood Road – Rear conservatory and side conservatory – RNO

*Cllr Daly arrived at this point.*

71.4 F/16/78907 – 35 Oakgrove Road - Erection of a 4 bedroom dwelling, following demolition of existing bungalow (amended design to F/15/76112) – The Committee noted the reasons given for the refusal of the previous application by Eastleigh Borough Council (The proposed development due to its siting, design, massing, scale, materials, would create an unattractive and incongruous feature at odds with the appearance of the locality and detrimental to the character and pattern of development within Oakgrove Road. The proposal is contrary to saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011, policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising: - Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, published February 2014; and - Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes, submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2014' and Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011).), and also found that it was difficult to base decisions on the sketches provided. Whilst the Committee did not wish to object, the Clerk was asked to echo the previous refusal reasons, and also note the difficulty produced by using sketches.

71.5 T/16/78892 – 4 Garnier Drive – Fell 1 Holm Oak to rear - There was some confusion caused by the application form stating a different house number (14) than the letter (4). Also, the Committee was concerned that this application to fell a TPO comes after the dwelling has been standing for such a short period of time. The Committee also wished to know whether there was a supporting engineer report, as per section 8.2 on the application form. The Committee decided to object on the grounds of it being a healthy TPO tree only recently built near.

**Action: Clerk**

*5 members of the public arrived at this point.*

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

72.1 F/16/78481 – 33 New Road, Fair Oak, Single storey rear extension following conservatory removal – RNO – Permitted.

72.2 T/16/78570 – 195 Fair Oak Road – Crown reduction of 1 Cedar – Concerns raised (limit to deadwood and pruning) – Part consent, part refusal, just crown lift to 5m above ground

72.3 F/16/78671 – 43 Olympic Way – single storey side & rear extension following demo of garage & conservatory – RNO – Permitted

72.4 J/16/78724 – telephone mast at top of Church Road – RNO - approval

## **73. Clerk's Report**

73.1 The Clerk reported that in the previous week there had been a public event regarding land north west of Horton Heath. Details would be circulated to Cllrs.

73.2 There was to be a presentation at Full Council by Bargate Homes on up to 30 new dwellings at the top of Church Road

73.3 The Council had received a request from a Mr Reid who wished to present his plans for his dwelling to the next meeting of the Parish Planning Committee. The Clerk was asked to invite him.

**Action: Clerk**

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

**74 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

74.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 9 August at 7:00pm in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke.

74.2 Any agenda items should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Tuesday 2 August 2016.

**75. Motion for confidential business**

75.1 Proposed Cllr Toher, 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.

*The members of the public left at this point*

**76. Reported Breaches of Development Control (confidential business)**

76.1 The Clerk reported on two alleged breaches and one concluded breach of development control.

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7:20pm*

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

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