

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee
held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke
commencing at 7.00pm on 28 May 2019**

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

In Attendance: Mr D Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)
Cllr Ray Dean (Eastleigh Borough Council)

Public Attendance: 0 members of the public were present

PLAN_1920_M03/

21 Apologies for Absence

21.1 All Councillors were present.

22 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 23 April 2019

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

22.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Greenwood, **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 23 April 2019 be accepted as a true record.

23 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

23.1 There were no matters arising from the above minutes.

24 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

24.1 There were no declarations of interest or requests for dispensation.

25 Consideration of Planning Applications

25.1 H/19/85522 – 36 Orchard Avenue – Garage Conversion with roof alterations to provide Carer Accommodation – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application.

25.2 H/19/85538 – 61 Itchen Avenue – Two storey side extension and garage conversion – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application.

25.3 H/19/85540 – 61 Fair Oak Road – Single storey rear extension – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application.

25.4 H/19/85647 – 2 Whalesmead Close – Two storey rear and first floor extensions – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application.

26 Report on recent planning decisions

26.1 H/19/85137 – 63 Fair Oak Road – Single storey rear and side extensions – The Planning Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to this application – The Borough Council permitted this application.

26.2 H/19/85142 – 22 Bishops Court – Application for works under tree preservation orders – The Planning Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application but wished to note that they were pleased there is a plan to plant two new trees in replacement – The Borough Council consented to this tree application.

26.3 H/19/85203 – 68 Church Road – Two and single storey side extensions and existing detached garage incorporated to form integral garage – The Committee considered this to be overdevelopment and not in keeping with the street scene of the surrounding area and therefore to object on those grounds – The Borough Council permitted this application.

26.4 X/19/85180 – Land to the rear of 58-60 Stoke Common Road – Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission F/18/84120 (amendment to garden and site width) for the construction of 4 no. three bedroom semi-detached dwellings with associated amenity space and off-road parking accessed from Wilmot Close, following demolition of existing garages, to allow the substitution of layout and house type plans – The Committee noted that the original application did not come before the Parish Council Planning Committee due to errors by the Borough Council and so they had not had an opportunity to consider the whole plan on its merits. As condition 1 states it is to ensure everything is done “in the interests of proper planning”, the Committee wondered how that could be varied. The Committee were also concerned about the landlocked nature of the gardens to the new dwellings, and there being no viable access to the remaining strip of garden from the rear of 58 and 60 Stoke Common Road. The Committee wished to object on all those grounds – The Borough Council permitted this application.

26.5 NC/19/85132 – 16 Church Road – Notification of proposed works to trees in conservation areas – The Committee noted that the application form incorrectly stated that the work was for a TPO tree and was NOT in the conservation area. Cllr Harris had asked the Planning Officer about this and had been told that the Officer had corrected the wording for the application type but left the form as it was. The Committee agreed that as the tree was healthy and not in danger of causing damage to any property there was no good reason to fell it. The Committee also wished to request a TPO be placed upon the tree to give it further protection – The Borough Council raised no objection to the notification.

26.6 T/19/85323 – St Mary’s Church – Application for works under tree preservation orders: 1 self-seeded holly(T1) – fell; 1 Beech (T2) – potential root pruning to facilitate building works to wall and 1 Sycamore (T3) – potential root pruning to facilitate building works to wall – The tree warden informed the Committee that if roots above a certain size were discovered during the proposed works then, according to the tree officer of the Borough, there would need to be a change in the design of the planned wall repairs. As this application came from the Parish Council, the Committee agreed to make no formal response to the Borough – The Borough Council consented to this tree application.

26.7 L/19/84935 – Itchen House – Erection of five buttresses to existing boundary wall – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application and wished to fully support the comments of the Heritage Consultant – the Borough Council granted consent to this listed building application.

26.8 T/19/85355 – Itchen Grange – Application for works under tree preservation orders: 1 Holm Oak (T1) – reduce by up to 1m; 1 Willow (T2) – remove 4 low limbs and prune back south east side of canopy by 1m; 2 Willow (T3 and T4) – repollard and (T5) – reduce and reshape by 1m – the tree warden informed the Committee that this appeared to be sensible tree management. The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application – The Borough Council consented to this tree application.

26.9 H/19/85129 – 9 Escombe Road – Replacement detached garage to the rear of the dwelling – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application – the Borough Council permitted this planning application.

26.10 H/19/85276 – 13 Hartley Road – Two storey side extension including an integral garage – The Committee noted that a similar application for this property had been refused in 2018. The Committee consider this application would be overdevelopment and incongruous. The Committee also believe that the first two reasons given for the refusal of the previous application still apply. The Committee wished to object on all those grounds – the Borough Council refused this planning application.

27 Clerk's Report

27.1 The Clerk reported that following recent site visits to The Chase it is apparent that the vast majority of the sites intended to be passed to the Parish Council are not yet ready. The Borough Council agrees with this and therefore is not yet willing to enter the 12-month maintenance period necessary before the Parish Council needs to make a decision. The developer is being informed by the Borough Council of the necessary work still to be completed and the Parish Council has also informed the Borough of certain conditions that would need to be satisfied on its behalf. The Cemetery extension – Stoke Common Cemetery – is closest to being ready to switch to the monitoring period and the Parish has begun to identify how it would set up the site and where the first interments would be situated.

27.2 The Clerk also reported that a visit to Nine Acres for a progress check indicated that the developer is expecting to be off site in the next couple of months. Work is about to begin on the play area and the allotment and orchard site which are the key areas of interest for the Parish Council. The problem with the new allotment building has been rectified.

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

28.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 11th June 2019, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications.

28.2 Any agenda items should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 3rd June 2019.

29 Motion for Confidential Business

29.1 Proposed Cllr Brown, Seconded Cllr Toher, **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.

30 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential Business)

30.1 The Clerk reported four alleged breaches of Development Control.

30.2 The Clerk reported six concluded breaches of Development Control.

30.3 Cllrs reported no additional items of confidential business

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.16pm

Chair's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Clerk's Signature: _____ Date: _____