

CHANDLER'S FORD PARISH COUNCIL - PLANNING, HIGHWAYS AND LICENCING COMMITTEE

30 SEPTEMBER 2013

Fryern Hill Pavilion, Greenways, Chandler's Ford

(7.00 pm – 7.45 pm)

PRESENT: Councillor Ms Hodgson (Chairman), Councillors Bicknell, Bull, Hosegood and Streeter

APOLOGIES: Councillor Cole

In attendance – Stephen Mursell, Parish Clerk

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No members of Council stated a declaration of Interest.

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Members did not raise any issues over the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 17 July 2013.

It was AGREED that:

1)The minutes of the Planning, Highways and Licensing Committee held on 17 July 2013 be signed by the Chairman as an accurate record.

3. MATTERS ARISING

Cllr Bicknell advised members that a seminar on Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 agreements was being held at Eastleigh Borough Council on 3 October, which members were invited to attend.

It was AGREED that:

1)The Parish Clerk would circulate details of this seminar to members of this committee

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Members considered the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Planning, Highways and Licensing Committee. It was agreed that these would be tabled at a subsequent Parish Council meeting for review alongside the TORs of all other committees.

It was AGREED that:

1)The terms of reference for this committee be agreed

It was noted that as Councillor Oldham-Arnett had ceased to be a member of the Parish Council this committee's membership was subsequently reduced.

It was AGREED that:

- 1)The vacancy for a member of this committee be referred back to the Parish Council

5. CONSULTATION ON TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT POLICY AND HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE

Members had not considered the survey questions and all members wished to have more time to consider the questions. It was agreed that members would consider the survey questions and forward individual responses by 4th October to either the Clerk or Cllr Hodgson.

It was AGREED that:

- 1)The Clerk and Cllr Hodgson would meet on 4th October to collate a response on behalf of this committee

6. PLANNING APPLICATION: LAND TO REAR OF 36 SHAFTESBURY AVENUE

Members considered other similar developments that had taken place in this vicinity and considered the detailed plans together with the streetscene of the proposed development and would raise no objection to the application. Members considered that site access would be very difficult from Shaftesbury Avenue and considered site access would only be possible off The Crossways. Members considered that restrictions to the hours of construction and delivery of materials to the site should be restricted to protect the amenity of other householders.

It was AGREED that the following comments be made to Eastleigh Borough Council on the planning application:

- 1)In principle members raised no objection to the erection of two semi-detached houses on the site
- 2)Members considered that construction work and deliveries to the site should commence no earlier than 8.00 a.m. in consideration of the residents in the vicinity

7. PLANNING APPLICATION: 18 NICHOL ROAD

Members consider the application for the erection of a detached dwelling at 18 Nichol Road. Members considered that the plot was sufficiently large to accommodate the size

of the proposed dwelling and considered that the proposed dwelling was in keeping with the current street-scene.

It was AGREED that:

1) There was no objection to the proposed erection of a 5 bedroom dwelling at 18 Nichol Road following the demolition of the existing bungalow

8. PLANNING APPLICATION: 127 KINGSWAY

Members consider the application for the erection of two detached dwellings at 127 Kingsway and the Clerk advised members that there was a written representation from a member of the public.

Members considered that the plot was sufficiently large to accommodate the two detached properties and noted that the footprint of the existing property was only marginally smaller than the combined two properties. Members were of the opinion that the site could accommodate both properties and there was only minor scrubbing out of bushes with little tree work required on the plot.

The Clerk advised members that the resident making the representation was concerned about cars exiting Thornbury Heights and the two proposed dwellings and going northwards where visibility was reduced because of parking of cars on the bend in the road.

Members were of the opinion that the parking resulted from the lack of parking facilities at the nursery in Kingsway and that this was not a material fact in considering the application.

It was AGREED that:

1) There was no objection to the application for the construction of two detached dwellings at 127 Kingsway

2) The parking issues emanating from users of the nursery at Kingsway should be brought to the attention of Eastleigh Borough Council to consider any potential parking restrictions in Kingsway

9. OTHER PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Members considered the remaining applications brought to this Committee.

It was AGREED that:

1)7b Tyrrel Road – the committee would raise no objection to the application on the basis that the Tree Officer confirms the trees are considered dead, diseased, dying or dangerous

2)1 Hocombe Road – the committee would raise no objection to the application on the basis that the Tree Officer confirms the trees are considered dead, diseased, dying or dangerous

3)30 Randall Road - the committee would raise no objection to the application on the basis that the Tree Officer confirms the trees are considered dead, diseased, dying or dangerous. The committee noted that it was intended that the Chestnut tree be felled to allow a Beech tree to mature, but members of the committee were of the opinion that the Beech tree should be felled to preserve the Chestnut tree

4)7 Malcolm Close – the committee objected to the tree being felled as there was no evidence that it was in decline or dangerous

5)127 Ashdown Road - the committee objected to the tree being felled as there was no evidence that it was in decline or dangerous. Members of the committee were of the opinion that work to the conifers may be preferred rather than the Ash tree be felled

6)40 Gordon Road - the committee objected to the tree being felled as there was no evidence that it was in decline or dangerous

7)3-5 Valley Road – the committee would raise no objection to the application as it was noted that pavement surface was uneven and considered dangerous