

BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 8 August 2017

Present: Cllrs Greenwood (Chair), Dean, Tidridge and Toher

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

Public Attendance: 3 members of the public were present

PLAN_1718_M07/

Public Session

61 Apologies for Absence

61.1 Apologies had been received and were accepted from Cllrs Francis, Brown and Thornton.

62 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 25 July 2017

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

62.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 25 July 2017 be accepted as a true record.

63 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

63.1 Item 53.1: The Clerk had provided the Brownfield definition to all Cllrs. Cllr Dean noted that as of 2014.

63.2 Item 55.1: The Borough Council has been notified again.

63.3 Item 55.2: A map of the TPO trees at the Mount has not yet been found.

64 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

64.1 None declared or requested.

65 Consideration of Planning Applications

65.1 F/17/80188 – Land to the rear of 86 Edward Avenue – erection of 9 dwellings, 6 three bed and 3 four bed houses with vehicular access, parking, landscaping and refuse storage – a resident spoke to raise issues with the application, specifically regarding the proximity of trees to plots 5-9, and to a lesser extent plots 1-4. He believed that new residents would rapidly request to have the trees removed. Cllr discussion confirmed all of the objections previously raised on this application, and also raised additional concerns regarding the limited number of visitor parking spaces, the problems flagged by Southern Water regarding the long-term maintenance of the SUDS, the lack of work done regarding land contamination, the housing being neither what is needed by Bishopstoke as a whole, nor in keeping with the character of the local housing, and the question of whether there is a sufficient buffer between the development and the Cemetery extension.

Cllrs also raised the question of why the Forestry Commission was not being consulted, and the issue of road safety was highlighted several times, with major concerns regarding having three roads in such

Initial: _____ Date: _____

close proximity on a blind bend. There has reportedly been one near miss in the last few months already.

Finally, it was noted that if the application is permitted, arrangements would need to be made to ensure that interments are not disturbed.

2 members of the public left at this point

65.2 H/17/80820 – 77 Olympic Way – Single storey rear extension – the Committee agreed to raise no objection to this application.

65.3 H/17/81081 – 69 Underwood Road – Rear extension – the Planning Committee noted the Borough Council's refusal of the previous application for this work (F/17/80125) and agreed that this application had not changed. Therefore the Committee agreed to object using the Borough Council's reasoning.

65.4 RM/17/80862 – Land at Fair Oak Road – Reserved matters application pursuant to Outline Application O/14/75086 for construction of 16 dwellings with access off Fair Oak Road – The Committee agreed to object to the application as the parking is heavily skewed towards the private housing portion of the development; there is a reported agreement that, following the development at the Chase, this entire development was to be affordable housing; additional concerns were raised regarding access to the site both for traffic and for construction vehicles, which risk damaging the trees; finally, no pavement is indicated near the proposed pedestrian crossing. The Committee also noted the lack of a highways report and requested that one be made available, given the direct impact the development would have on the main road through Bishopstoke.

66 Report on recent planning decision

66.1 F/17/80350 – 37 Rogers Road – Loft conversion with gable extension and rear facing dormer window. Single storey rear extension and garden store building – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application – EBC Refused permission.

66.2 F/17/80445 – 41 Whalesmead Road – Ground and first floor rear extensions and addition of front dormer windows – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application – EBC Permitted the application.

66.3 F/17/80468 – 3 Church Close – Erection of two storey detached garage – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application. They also wished to comment to the Borough that the list of consultees appeared to be missing from the application – EBC Permitted the application.

66.4 H/17/80714 – 214 Fair Oak Road – Enlargement of existing front porch – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the application – EBC Permitted the application.

67 Clerk's Report

67.1 The Clerk reported that an appeal had been lodged regarding 6 St Austell Close.

67.2 The Clerk also reported on arrangements for planning applications received that need considering before the next planning meeting, and noted that parking along Church Road was being reconsidered by the Borough following the consultation. The Clerk was requested to contact the Borough and ask them to show consideration for what happens to neighbouring roads if restrictions are applied to Church Road, and also to ask whether occasional parking could be allowed at Dutton Lane.

Action: Clerk

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

Initial: _____ Date: _____

68.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 12 September 2017, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications.

68.2 Any agenda items should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 4 September 2017.

69 Motion for Confidential Business

69.1 Motion not proposed.

70 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential Business)

70.1 The Clerk reported no new breaches of Development Control.

70.2 The Clerk reported no concluded breaches of Development Control.

70.3 Cllrs reported no alleged breaches of development control.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.45pm

Chair's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Clerk's Signature: _____ Date: _____