

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF URCHFONTS PARISH COUNCIL held on Wednesday 13 April 2016 at 7:08pm in the Conference Room of Urchfont Village Hall.

Present: UPC Chair Cllr Mottram, Vice Chair Cllr Donald, Lead of Planning Cllr Hill, Cllrs: Day, Gibb, Holt, Mitchell, Stephens, Thomas & Planning Administrator Sandra Johnston.

Also present: Parish Clerk Bob Lunn, Wiltshire Cllr Philip Whitehead and 10 members of the public.

Cllr: Mottram welcomed all present and opened the Planning meeting;

1. Apologies for absence received: Cllr: Baker

2. Declarations of Interest: 5a) Cllr Holt: Non-pecuniary. 5b) Cllr Stephens: Pecuniary & Non-pecuniary. 5c) Cllr Hill: Non-pecuniary.

3. Minutes of a meeting held on 09 March 2016:

Pg 7: Statement given by Mrs Emma Chapman. EC requested the insertion of 'A' before 'Director of the WWT'. Pg 5: Final bullet point - 'GD agreed with Cllr Hill' not Cllr Holt. Pg 9: Final bullet point – Cllr Hill opined he, not Cllr Mitchell, made these comments. SJ replied that, due to the unusual amount of dialogue to record, when more than one Cllr had made the same comment, judicious condensing had taken place.

Cllr: Hill Proposed acceptance of these changes, Seconded by Cllr Day; agreed unanimously.

4. Matters arising from those Minutes: None.

5. Plans for discussion

Cllr: Hill reminded Council Members that when considering planning applications they must follow the guidance outlined in the Urchfont Parish Council Planning Policy and Procedure document (UPC/18) and its incorporated Statutory Authorities/Governing Documents, all of which can be found on the Wiltshire Council or Urchfont Parish Council websites. Also, that they should consider planning applications within the context of the 6 criteria laid down in the current Planning Policy Document. **Namely:** Scale of development; Visual impact upon the surrounding area; Relationship to adjoining properties; Design - bulk, height and general appearance; Environmental /Highway impact; Car parking.

**Urchfont Parish Council's role, as a Consultee, is to provide Wiltshire Council with UPC's views, which will be based on a balanced view across the Urchfont Parish community.

NB: The meeting was adjourned at the beginning of each Planning Application to enable members of the Public to express their views on that particular application.

5a) **16/01519/FUL** – Full Planning Application for an amendment to the design of Plot 1, Manor Farmyard, High Street, Urchfont, Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4QP; for Redcliffe Homes Ltd.

**Councillor Mottram adjourned the planning meeting for public participation:-

Statement by Mr Richard Hawkins – Resident of Urchfont

- The house has been built to the correct size and height but should be re-thatched to comply with the approved plans. If the thatch was to be 'pulled down' the roof would more resemble that of the building on the original approved drawing.
- Is of the belief that none of remedies proposed by Redcliffe will improve the appearance of the house.
- Strongly believes that if the roof design was incorrect, then the Architects should be held financially responsible. If the fault lies with the builders, then they should be held financially responsible.

**Councillor Mottram closed public participation and re-opened the planning meeting:

To date, 7 letters of Objection to this application had been received by UPC and/or WC Planning Office. A site meeting was held on 10/04/16 at which 8 Parish Councillors & S Johnston were present.

16/01519/FUL - The Planning Committee found as follows:

- **SH** – UPC are awaiting a response to their request for enforcement action. Plot 1 has ended up looking ridiculous: as though it had been built with a tiled roof which has now been over-thatched. SH not convinced a re-thatch would be looked for by WC. He is of the opinion that the suggested 'Eyebrows' (segmented Arches) over the first floor windows would look completely wrong.

* SH then showed slides of the house on Plot 1, including 'photo-shopped' solutions from both Redcliffe and R. Hawkins, also photographs taken of all thatched properties in the Village. Thanked RH for his input. Cllrs discussed one photoshop picture which showed a dark beam covering the top 3 courses of bricks; immediately under the thatch. If the beam were flush with the bricks beneath, it could bring the façade more in line with other thatched dwellings. Such an implanted beam might well produce a reasonable amendment.

- SH - The Porch: The approved drawing showed a wider, squatter, porch with a thatch that would have been installed at an angle of 50 degrees, not at what would now appear to be a 55 degree angle. SH opined the finished porch looked like a pimple on the face of the building. (The outside light installed by the builders needed planning permission but appeared to have been switched off after intervention by UPC) This house is an embarrassment situated at the most focal and photographed part of Urchfont.
- Redcliffe have still not quoted the actual height of the building. Opined that in time a thatched ridge could 'slump' bringing the roofline down a bit. SH begged to differ.
- SH's main concern was, that if UPC objected to this application, he was of the opinion that WC were bound to pass it and Urchfont would be left looking at the consequences for years to come.
- Q: Is the present thatch far enough forward to stop the walls from getting damp? A: Yes, the building also has a damp course.
- **TH** – Feels strongly that the amended Plans look ridiculous. The letters of Objection posted on-line put forward a lot of ideas: can UPC explore any of those? Entering into a dialogue would show that we UPC is willing to try to achieve a solution.
- **DM** - The Planning Committee must concentrate on the application on the table, which proposes segmented arches. This building will be prominent for at least the next 100 years and will always look out of place in that particular street scene. WC should dismiss this application but they may already have in mind an option which they feel is acceptable. Can the Planning Committee object to this proposal and hold up Cllr Holt's document as the view of UPC?
- **AS** - There should be no compromises. UPC Planning Committee's decision should refer back to the planning application UPC originally approved. This current application is wasting the time of both WC and UPC. There should be a re-submission.
- **NM** – Plot 1 now looks silly, an embarrassment. It is a crying shame, considering how many years it has taken UPC and parishioners to agree on the best result for the development of Manor Farmyard. It is also disappointing that Helen Garside (Cons. Officer) has not become more involved in this travesty.
- **RT** – Felt strongly that UPC should not offer any suggestions but object in the strongest possible terms. All are agreed that Plot 1 has not been built in accordance with the approved plans and feel insistent that it should be re-built to the original planning application; but, if this option is not open to us, then UPC should speak with WC's assigned Planning Officer requesting dialogue to find an acceptable solution. Should UPC write formally to the Planning Dept but contact the Conservation Officer separately?
- **PW** – Opined the best way forward may be to ask for a joint working party, made up of Planners, Developers, UPC & Residents. If WC refuses this planning application, there is a 99% chance that the developer will go to Appeal. Whatever solutions UPC & WC agree upon, if it involves taking a house apart, an Inspector may look at this request and say there is little advantage in this action. If the builder has made a genuine mistake and gained no advantage by so doing, then an Inspector would be unlikely to enforce the destruction of a thatched roof and its surrounding timbers / brick work etc.
- **GD** – UPC should object because this building has not been built to the original consent. Offering a compromise rather than a flat 'no' dilutes UPC strength of feeling and that would be wrong. If we do not propose the idea of a joint working party, would WC be likely to offer the possibility themselves?
- **BD** - Although we would all like the thatch to be removed and re-done, the possibility looks slim: would UPC be conceding that point in suggesting a w/party to come up with an agreed solution? BD believes it is idealistic to think UPC can demand this house be virtually demolished and rebuilt: Redcliffe would fight that every inch of the way. Therefore, UPC must be pragmatic and fight for an acceptable solution.

*Councillor Holt proposed a response to the Planning Officer;

16/01519/FUL – Urchfont Parish Council's Planning Committee **Object** to this application because it does not reflect the original consent. Urchfont Parish Council would be happy to enter into dialogue with Wiltshire Council, Redcliffe Homes and their Architects to find a solution which is acceptable to all parties.

(*With their response to Wiltshire Council UPC also included a paper, prepared by Cllr Holt, reviewing all thatched houses in Urchfont Village. This document may be viewed on-line or by request to SJ or B Lunn). The proposal was seconded by Cllr Donald and passed; with 6 supporting votes and 2 against.

5b) **16/01782/LBC** – Listed Building Consent to remove 9 no D/G wooden framed windows and 1 no S/G metal framed window; replacement of 10 no wooden framed S/G Windows to match existing 6 windows; all at Redhone Cottage, Townsend, Urchfont, Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4RR for Mr Paul Clark.

*To date, no letters of Objection to this application had been received by UPC and/or WC Planning Office. A site meeting was held on 10/04/16 at which 8 Parish Councillors & S Johnston were present. Cllr Stephens was present but, having declared an 'Interest', did not take part in the dialogue.

16/01782/LBC - The Planning Committee found as follows:

- It was noted that the current windows to be replaced had, themselves, replaced original windows in Redhone Cottage but not under any Listed Building Consent.
- The owners were commended for wishing to bring the house back to its original form.

Councillor Holt proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application; seconded by Cllr Day: motion passed unanimously, with 1 abstention due to a Declaration of Interest.

5c) **16/03023/TCA** – Work to Trees in a Conservation Area: 1 no Ash Tree – reduce by approx 35% and shape crown accordingly; at Penning House, High Street, Urchfont, Wilts., SN10 4QH, for Mrs O Pottinger.

*To date, no letters of Objection to this application had been received by UPC and/or WC Planning Office. A site meeting was held on 10/04/16 at which 3 Parish Councillors & S Johnston were present.

16/03023/TCA - The Planning Committee found as follows:

- This Ash tree is now very large and growing out from many stems. If not dealt with now, it is likely to become dangerous in the foreseeable future.

Councillor Thomas proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application; seconded by Cllr Day: motion passed unanimously.

6. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council since 03 March 2016

6a) **15/12573/FUL** - Full Planning Application for Change to Positioning of close boarded fencing in vicinity of Plots 11,12, and 18; increase in size of garden to Plot 18; repositioning of shed in garden of Plot 11; and siting of shed in garden to Plot 10 (Retrospective Application); all at Manor Farmyard, High Street, Urchfont, Devizes Wilts., SN10 4QP for Redcliffe Homes Ltd. **Approve with Conditions**

6b) **15/12670/FUL** - Full Planning Application for a Porch and Parking Area with new Access Road; all at 7 Ballingers, Urchfont, Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4RL for Mr C Burchell. **Approve with Conditions**

6c) **16/00730/TCA** – Works to trees in a Conservation Area to include Reduction of Leylandii Hedging by 50% in height; Crown reduction of Sycamore by 40%; Crown reduction of Sycamore by 30%; Crown reduction of Elm by 30%, all at 16 Manor Farmyard, Urchfont, Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4BA for Mr Pirie. **No Objection**

6d) **16/01373/TCA** - Works to trees in a Conservation Area to include; Felling of 1 Cherry Plum tree; Crown reduction of 3 Cherry trees by approx 30%; Reduction of 1 small Poplar tree by approx 30%; Felling of 7 Cypress trees, all at 'Moonacre' (formerly Swanborough), High Street, Urchfont Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4RP for Mrs Maria Kemp. **No Objection**

6e) **16/01845/TCA** - Works to trees in a Conservation Area to include Reduction of T1 -Weeping Willow by 50%; Reduction of T2 - Holly Tree by 25% and Felling of T3 - Crab Apple; all at Rowan House, The Green, Urchfont, Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4QU, for Mr & Mrs M Wood. **No Objection**

6f) **16/01402/FUL** - Full Planning Application for erection of single storey Extension, at The Old Chapel, The Cartway, Wedhampton, Wilts., SN10 3QD, for Mr & Mr G Willis. **Approve with Conditions**

6g) **16/01480/FUL** - Full Planning Application for erection of a single storey Extension; Demolishing of existing Pool House & Garages and erection of new Pool House and Garage; all at 'The Glebe', Church Lane, Urchfont, Wilts., SN10 4QT, for Mr & Mrs P Bancroft. **Approve with Conditions**

7. Matters for Report

There being no other business, the Planning Meeting closed at 7:47 pm.

The proposed date of the next Planning Meeting is **Wednesday 11 May 2016 at 7:00 pm** in Urchfont Village Hall: at item A on the Full Council agenda.

Planning Administrator Sandra Johnston – 01380 848774 – 07808 124721 – sandra-j@virgin.net

NB Hard copies of all Planning Applications & Plans are with the Planning Administrator and may be inspected by arrangement at any time. Planning Applications and their documents should also be visible on www.urchfont-pc.gov.uk or go to www.wiltshire.gov.uk and click on 'Planning Applications' – 'Planning applications online' - 'Search by planning application number'; type application number into the box, click 'Search' and when the Planning Application Search comes up in blue, click on the underlined case number and the webpage for this planning application should open.

Signed

Date