

**DRAFT MINUTES OF AN INTERIM MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF URCHFON
PARISH COUNCIL held on Wednesday 22 August 2018 at 7:00 pm in the main hall of Urchfont
Village Hall.**

Present: UPC Councillors:- Chair Dave Mottram (DM) Vice Chair Graham Day (GD) Lead of Planning Trevor Hill (TH) Philip Cottell (PC) Lewis Cowen (LC) Graham Creasey (GC) Richard Hawkins (RH) Maria Kemp (MK) Nicky Mitchell (NM) David Stevens (DS) and Planning Administrator Sandra Johnston (SJ).

Also present: Parish Clerk Bob Lunn (BL) WC Cllr: Philip Whitehead (PW) and 39 members of the public

1. Apologies for absence received: Cllr: Bill Donald.

2. Declarations of Interest: - None

Cllr: Mottram welcomed all present and thanked Councillors and the public for attending a non-scheduled meeting. He asked that members of the public who wished to speak restrict their time to approx 3 minutes and attempt to not repeat the comments of those who had already spoken. He then handed over to Cllr: Hill, as Lead UPC Councillor for Planning, to continue the business of the Planning Meeting.

Council members were reminded by Cllr Hill that when considering planning applications they must follow the guidance in the UPC 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, they should have regard to visual impact upon the surrounding area and relationship to adjoining properties.

* 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** Cllr Hill stressed the fact that Urchfont PC was only a consultee and WC Planning Dept. would make the final decision on this application.

3. Plans for discussion:

18/06977/FUL – Full planning application for the Erection of Nine Dwellings together with Associated Works on Land at Uphill; at the junction of Friars Lane & Crooks Lane, Urchfont, Wilts., SN10 4SA – For Mr & Mrs Ellis; Multon and Bailey.

**Cllr Hill stated for the minutes that a recently circulated poster 'Save The View' was not produced by UPC or any member of UPC, but by a member of the public.

TH continued.....

*To date the UPC Planning Administrator (SJ) had received 33 letters of representation, all objecting to planning application 18/06977/FUL and unfortunately non in support. To date WC had received 13, all duplicates of those received by UPC. **TH** had compiled a summary of all letters and would read out his summarisation of the concerns & comments. He appreciated that many of those present had written these letters and apologised if his actual wording was not verbatim but trusted that the gist had not been lost in his translation;

- Greenfield/Inappropriate Site, too much development within Parish already. (12 comments)
- Would lose important view, one identified within NP (17 comments)
- There are more dwellings proposed (9) than identified within NP (7 comments)
- Too many Expensive Houses already and not enough Affordable homes (8 comments)
- Access roads to and from development totally inadequate to deal with extra traffic. Inadequate site access (24 comments)
- Pedestrian safety compromised as no pavements – applies to both during and after construction (16 comments)
- Inadequate space within site for Refuse/Recycling Collection vehicles. (2 comments)
- Traffic Management Plan proposed during construction period is 'totally unworkable' – add even more problems to access roads. (15 comments)
- Concerns regarding flooding to lower levels from 'run off' from site. (12 comments)

- Ridge height of proposed buildings higher than surrounding dwellings / misleading information within description provided by applicants. (5 comments)
- Concerns regarding extra light pollution generated by this development. (4 comments)
- Loss of privacy to neighbours. (3 comments)
- Increase pressure on water services, drainage, sewage etc. (4 comments)

**** Cllr. Hill then adjourned the planning meeting for public participation:**

Statement by Nicola Hammond – Resident of Uphill

From personal experience Ms Hammond had found that an application for a single dwelling, submitted to WC by an individual, is subject to a great deal of scrutiny as regards design, materials and proposed function of the building. Considerations by the planning officer include potential effects on surrounding dwellings, local infrastructure, suitability of the site pertaining to waste disposal... and even secure storage of bicycles at the ratio of 1 per bedroom up to 3 bedrooms and a reduction in storage thereafter. Submission of a block application, such as this, would appear not to be subject to such rigours. A level playing field would be appreciated on which large developers have to abide by the same restrictions as those a sole applicant has to observe.

The number of dwellings proposed for this site has been approximated from 7 *up* to 9, not *down* to 5 and no dwelling, apart from the bungalow, is in any way 'future proofed' to allow for any change in circumstance of the householders. Should family members become temporarily or permanently disabled and struggle with stairs, an open plan design would not accommodate them. It appears now to be part of planning procedure to install internet technology but rarely the introduction of a ground floor shower/wet room or single domestic lift that could create a 'home for life'.

Where are the statements relating to the designs of these buildings that show they would be in harmony with their surroundings and not clash with dwellings in the immediate vicinity? The inadequate layout of this site, with its lack of turning space and provision for extra household and visiting vehicles will surely result in imposition on the surrounding neighbourhood. Surely a designer of a new development in a rural area should anticipate the need for footpaths and lighting, as well as taking into account the poor infrastructure of the surrounding roadways?

In Ms Hammond's opinion, this is a shiny and insensitive new development, the like of which are springing up all over the country, with little or no regard to the historic nature of where they are being built. It is also the first Greenfield site proposed for development. This field's use has always been agricultural. If the application is passed, as she believes it eventually will be, a precedent would be set for all owners of local agricultural land who may wish to benefit by selling parcels of their land for development.

Statement by Jim Stephenson – resident of Urchfont

Mr Stephenson disagreed with good agricultural land being used for development and the loss of one of the best views in the village. His main concern was safety, seemingly disregarded in all Urchfont housing developments. Vehicles from Hartley House (The Beeches development) have to either back into the driveway, or back out from it onto Blackboard Lane; a narrow road used by school traffic & children. The Peppercombe development is adjacent to a narrow junction between 3 roads and shared with all Village Hall traffic & pedestrians and walkers using the footpaths running either side of the development site. Yet again, no provision made for road widening, pathways or street lighting. The proposed Uphill development requires access up a narrow lane, 4.2 metres at its widest, originally designed for horses & carts. Lorries, minus wing mirrors, can be up to 2.55 metres wide, leaving little room for pedestrians. Again, no provision is apparent on these plans to provide the safety of footpaths & street lighting.

There are farm entrances to either side of the roadway at the apex of Crooks lane; the right being blind to all passing traffic. Concerning safety, occupants of Foxley Fields and Uphill who require the bus or wish to walk on Salisbury Plain must by necessity traverse this lane and it is Mr Stephenson's belief that an accident is waiting to happen, especially on dark winter mornings & nights. Other concerns include the possible effect of the development on existing aged sewage systems and of the surface water run-off; especially on the damaged and sunken roadway at the corner junction (opposite the site entrance) which floods badly whenever it rains.

Statement by Val Brockie – Resident of Uphill

When Mrs Brockie and her husband bought their cottage at 1 Uphill in 1972, their main reason was because of the stunning views across to the Downs, Pewsey Vale & the White Horse and the quiet, tranquil & open rural aspect on the edge of the lovely village of Urchfont. This view has since been designated an 'Important View' on the Neighbourhood Plan. In 1972, no.1 Uphill Cottages also commanded a view from the South side of the property, across to Salisbury Plain. When the owner of that land grew a triple row of tall trees along the field's boundary, sadly this aspect disappeared. As, unfortunately, did sunlight from November to March. Mrs Brockie understands that loss of a view cannot normally be taken into consideration when objecting to a planning application but believes that, because this was made an 'Important View' in the UWLNP, this is a perfectly acceptable point to be raised. Why was this site even considered for development if it is an 'Important View Site'; as she had been led to believe that one of the core objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan was to protect areas such as this from development?

She wished to quote one of the bullet points from the map of IMPORTANT VIEWS IN THE UWLNP; In Section 6) Countryside and Nature, etc. it says, to '*Identify important attractive views in and out of the villages and formulate a policy for their protection. (86% were in favour)*'.

Mrs Brockie thought it of interest that at the Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Meetings in November 2014, held in Urchfont Village Hall for parishioners to vote on potential development sites around the village, the map of 'Important Views' up on display did not show the Uphill site. The public were told this was an oversight and it was added afterwards. Mrs Brockie wished to know if there are any other plans afoot to develop other UWLNP designated 'Important View Sites' around the village? And if not, she wished to know why this particular 'Important View' site had been singled out?

It is her belief that the development will eventually take place and the open eastern aspect to the front of Uphill Cottages will disappear, along with the peace & tranquility currently enjoyed by residents of the Uphill & Foxley Fields area of Urchfont. Mrs Brockie & her husband have found the worry of the past months very stressful & depressing; so much so they were seriously considering moving.

Statement by Keith Brockie – Resident of Uphill

Mr Brockie has noted from the developer's document that the visual aspect of the proposed site is neutral. This, in his opinion, is being economical with the truth. If this development goes ahead, when looking to the West from Lydeaway and viewing Urchfont from across the fields, it will appear that not much has visually changed. Conversely, looking eastwards from 1 – 4 Uphill Cottages, from Coppers Yew and for those in Foxley Fields overlooking the site, there will have been a 100% loss of a view. Mr Brockie would not call this positively one sided result a 'neutral outcome'.

Since his arrival in 1972, 36 additional houses have been added to the Foxley Fields and Uphill area and, apart from widening the top of Crooks Lane when Foxley Fields was built, nothing has been done to change or improve the traffic situation. It should also be noted that the widening scheme was of no benefit whatsoever, as all residents of Crooks Lane have had no option other than to park their cars & work vehicles on the road, thus converting it once more to a single track lane. Even though there is little enough room for residents to park in Foxley Fields, Mr Brockie has noted that the construction traffic plan requests that, for the duration of the build, all vehicles on Crooks Lane park inside Foxley Fields during site working hours. From this request, he deduces that the developers think the road is too narrow for heavy traffic during that period. If this is the case, then surely it is too narrow before the proposed development and obviously still too narrow after completion? Living by the sharp bend at the Friars Lane & Crooks lane junction, he, his wife, and those in the vicinity have witnessed countless near misses as vehicles traverse the lanes in either direction. Major accidents have also occurred; luckily, so far, with no fatalities.

Being one of the areas of farming that surround the village, five local farms make use of this corner junction at Uphill. Mr Brockie recalled Friday 3rd August, this year. He noted a combine and approx 10 trailer loads of corn passing his house that day, harvested from the field near Uphill Cottages. This was in conjunction with 7 to 8 loads of straw being brought in to Uphill Farm. Altogether, that was approx 36 passes of his house. He admitted that was the busiest day, as the farm traffic on 2nd, 4th & 5th was a lot less. The next increase in traffic will be when the maize is harvested, followed by the replanting of the corn field. Add to that scenario the necessary density & movement of farm vehicles: Uphill Farm tractors pass by daily to & from their site at Connock. If this plan is passed, then all these vehicles will have to negotiate a 6 way junction which includes a blind bend.

One of the '6 way junction' roads (towards Lydeaway) forms the access to the bungalow 'Harraways' and to the driveway for 38 Crooks Lane. These occupants are able to drive in and perform a 3 point-turn out when they leave their homes. Because of the narrowness of this road all other vehicles will have to either reverse into it or back out across the '6 way' junction. With this in mind and for safety's sake, if the development goes ahead, then the temporary widening of the lane leading towards Lydeaway should be a permanent one.

Statement by Malcolm Smith – resident of Urchfont

Mr Smith was aware of, and agreed with, the many & various reasons given why this proposed plan for development on the designated site at Uphill should be rejected. In the light of growing public concern, and highlighted by the high attendance of residents at that evening's meeting, he asked for this planning application to be 'Called In' to WC by Urchfont's divisional Councillor Philip Whitehead.

*(**PW** – Councillor Whitehead answered that it was only for UPC to request that a planning application under their consideration be 'Called In'.)

Mr Smith continued:- When the UWLNP was sent for examination, the Examiner queried the discrepancy on the document between this '*Important View, worthy of a special landscape designation*' and the 'approved' site designation. The Examiner was assured by UPC that the two designations were compatible. Mr Smith questioned why, in clear contravention of the legal requirements, this correspondence between UPC and the Examiner was not made public at the time and stated that, in light of this, he would continue his enquiries as to the validity of the UWLNP. He was of the belief that having a made Neighbourhood Plan was preferable to a parish having no NP but it was his opinion that this site at Uphill should never have been designated as suitable for development. If this application is approved, Mr Smith questions what that precedent will mean for the future of all other UWLNP designated Important Views?

Statement by Mr Malcolm Taylor – Resident of Urchfont

Mr Taylor agreed with all previous concerns; i.e. Increased traffic on narrow lanes with no footpaths: Limited parking facilities in the area before introducing extra households and an increase of surface water & sewage into old pipes & drains already under pressure.

In September 2010 Mr & Mrs Taylor submitted planning application E/10/1191/FUL for provision of a parking bay outside their house, Baish Cottage, The Bottom; a few hundred yards from this proposed development at Uphill. It was refused by WC. Their appeal (reference APP/Y3940/D/10/2141346) was dismissed in January 2011. Mr Taylor read out some of the comments made by G.M. Hollington, an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, as follows:-

"The area (Uphill) is served by narrow lanes and dominated by trees and vegetation. The site of the proposed development contributes to the semi-rural character. The development would therefore be a substantial, adverse change which would significantly harm the area's character and appearance. The proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area".

So if a small car parking bay could have that amount of negative impact on an area, what will a housing estate of 9 houses have? It appeared to Mr Taylor that the Planning Department did not appear to be consistent in their decisions and did not afford private individuals the same considerations as developers.

Statement by Clare Cannon – resident of Urchfont

Mrs Cannon believes that Urchfont was selected to be developed because of all the facilities and amenities it has to offer. This new development is proposed on the extreme edge of the village, next to the Foxley Fields estate, from which mothers & children already have difficulty traversing narrow lanes & roadways to attend Urchfont Primary School and use the playing field, both of which lie on the opposite side of the village. Being a volunteer in the Community Shop, she knows the younger families make little use of it; also the Post Office as the lanes are just too narrow for walking with pushchairs & toddlers. In Mrs Cannon's opinion, the Uphill area is an area devoted mainly to farms & farming and to build a new housing development there is not practical or suitable, being too far out for families to feel a part of the village community.

Statement by Bob Organ – resident of Urchfont

Mr Organ wished to point out that the last 2/3 developments in Urchfont had raised early concerns about dominant skylines being created but no changes had been made to any plans, resulting in new dwellings being built which dominate their surrounding neighbourhood.

Statement by Nicola Sage– (read at her request by the Planning Administrator (SJ)

Ms Sage is a resident of Urchfont, living at Foxley Fields adjacent to the by-way.

Firstly Ms Sage wished to apologise for bothering village residents with her SAVE flyer delivery and to the Parish Council for not understanding that a Neighbourhood Plan was already 'made' which had approved this site at Uphill for house building. In retrospect she realised 'the view' campaign was misplaced, and further apologised for wasting people's time by suggesting the view was an issue still available for debate. Ms Sage questioned 2 points relating to the developer's information... 1) Point 6.10 in the Planning Statement says *'no fewer than seven 2 and 3 bedroom properties, 1 bungalow and two 4 bedroom dwellings'*. This totals ten, but in other information given on this statement it says 9 dwellings will be built... 2) In the Landscape and Visual Appraisal report, point 4.3.4 states that *'trees along the southern boundary create a break between the site and the adjacent residential property'*. This is not correct, as the trees were removed on 28th March 2018. Two further points regarding the Planning consideration were; 1) The Planning Statement says in Point 6.30 that *'a flood risk assessment is not a requirement of this application'*, regardless of the fact that Friars Lane fills up like a paddling pool each winter. Point 2) The Planning document states that a drainage strategy will be carried out and *'the necessary percolation tests can accommodate SUDS'*. A major concern about a new housing development at Uphill is the possibility of an increase in water flowing down to 'The Bottom'. It is to be hoped that consideration has been given to this and the village does not risk losing this attractive woodland area through flooding and water erosion.

According to the UWLNP, *'there is a proven shortage of affordable housing in the village'*. Given that the majority of the approved sites for development in Urchfont accommodate less than five homes and are therefore not eligible for the 30% affordable rule, Ms Sage questions how the village will ever be able to provide the much needed additional social housing? The proposed site at Uphill adjoins existing housing association built properties, so to extend the Foxley Fields estate would seem a better fit with Core Policy 57 guidance that says *'having regard to the compatibility of adjoining buildings'*. The same document goes on to quote the Neighbourhood Plan at point 3.9, *'that further development here [the land at Uphill] would enhance this part of the village, giving Foxley Fields a greater sense of community ...'* Obviously increasing the number of new dwellings to 12 or 14 would increase traffic volume into a junction already questionable as being suitable for a proposed 9 or 10 dwellings to join, but hopefully that is an issue that will be rectified; regardless of the number or types of houses that are built.

**** Cllr Hill closed public participation and re-opened the planning meeting:**

TH – As many comments had been made regarding the The Urchfont Wedhampton Lydeaway Neighbourhood Plan (UWLNP), Cllr Hill felt it necessary to make the following statement: "The UWLNP took a long time to be 'made'. Back in Dec/Jan of 2014/15 there were 3 Public meetings held in this village hall which allowed residents to vote for individual sites to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The majority of those present voted for this site. The UWLNP was examined by an Independent Examiner before being commended by UPC to WC to be 'made'. Having been 'made' the UWLNP is now part of WC Local Plan and is therefore a legally binding document. If anyone has good reason to question the validity of the Neighbourhood Plan then I (TH) would invite them to send any documented evidence to Wiltshire Council".

RH – Stated that he had already questioned something and been told that the Plan was made and any objections needed to have been sent in within 6 weeks of the referendum result.

TH – The policies outlined in the UWLNP should be used to determine what we want built in our area. With regard to the application being considered that evening, whatever observations & response UPC sends to WC, or the final decision eventually reached by the Planning Dept; obviously the outcome will not be to the satisfaction of all.

GD – Had studied all the letters of representation concerning this application and did not want to dismiss any of the public's concerns. He himself was a layman and had been led to believe that all technical concerns would be addressed by the experts at WC, but he encouraged all who had submitted letters of representation to UPC to also submit them to WC. People have stated a preference for affordable housing

and, for various reasons (mainly related to site access and layout), recent new developments in the village had not delivered sufficient of them which meant that the next housing developments on sites identified in the UWLNP should provide proportionately more. He reminded councillors that he is on record as not being overly sympathetic to developers' profits or the argument that high land costs justify high-price houses. For this particular application, Cllr Day was very concerned by the Construction Traffic Management Statement and public parking suspensions as stated by the Architects, which he regarded as being high-handed and insensitive.

(Tech Note 6350/01 para 4.6: On-street resident parking does take place along Crooks Lane which will cause issues for HGV access to the site. It is therefore proposed that a parking suspension will be needed during operational hours. It is noted that dwellings in this recent residential estate do have off-street parking. Any overspill parking would need to take place within Foxley Fields during the restricted hours. Mon – Fri: 07.30–18.00 hrs. Sat: 08.00-01.00 hrs)

Since the making of the NP, this application is the first to propose a development of more than 5 dwellings and UPC can therefore demand that at least 30% affordable houses be built. GD had been assured by the architects that on current plans 3 of the 2 bedroom semi-detached will be sold as 'affordables'.

TH – The provision of Affordable Houses was an important part of this application as this was the first site within the NP of 'more than 5 dwellings', which meant that 30% of the dwellings must be Affordable. He did not consider that the information provided within the application gave sufficient detail to ensure that the 'Affordable Houses' provided would meet the guidance outlined within the NPPF.

GD – This was the first time that he had sat through a planning application where 100% of the representational letters received by UPC were opposed to it. There being approx. 450 houses in Urchfont and 33 letters received, how could the UPC planning committee gain a balanced view across the community when so many households had not given their views on this proposal? Do we take the silence of the majority as approval for this application?

RH – had looked at housing expectations from the point of our Neighbourhood Plan and found that so far...1) 'Peppercombe' has delivered 5 x 4 bed houses at approx. £850,000. 2) 'The Beeches' has provided 1 bungalow priced at (RH believes to be) £630,000 - 3 x 2 bed semi's priced at almost £400,000 and 1 x 4 bed detached – price unknown. 3) Land opposite The Baish has planning permission for 1 x 3 bed house; a predictable price of approx £450,000 maybe? It was RH's opinion that an expected pricing of the Uphill builds, based on The Beeches, would be; Bungalow approx £475,000 - 3 bed approx 475,000 - 4 bed @ approx 550,000 – a 2 bed semi approx 325,000... or if sold as an 'Affordable' approx £250,000 (being 75% of the market value).

As stated in our NP, there are now only 2 large sites left to developed; Hales Farm - 12 houses & Wildmans Garage - 5 houses. Therefore only Hales Farm will be required to provide affordable houses. All remaining plots are small so will probably have a larger house built on them.

It was RH's personal opinion that, if all accept that £250,000 is an affordable house, then only 7 out of the 37 houses proposed in the NP might be 'affordables'. In actuality, this was not delivering a predominance of houses for young families, or small-scale housing for the elderly, that the community had expected from the making of a N. Plan. RH also opined that, if future developers of the larger sites proposed additional houses, as seemed common practice, final figures could be 7 'affordables' out of approx 40 new dwellings. RH believed that this meeting should have taken place in late July/early August 2016 when the Examiner raised a question about this site, as in an Important View also being a designated development site? RH suspected that, if the issue had been publicly discussed at that time, this site would not now be in the Neighbourhood Plan. Not only due to the Important View status but also due to public concerns such as site access difficulties and potential drainage problems.

DM – Quoted from the NP – 2 sites designated on site briefs – Peppercombe 4 dwellings on the NP but ended up with 5. The first two approved sites have produced larger houses but we are now seeing smaller houses and Affordables.

RH – This village really needs a predominance of houses produced for young families.

TH – Opined that a young family had bought a new 'affordable' on the Manor Farmyard development but, even though subsidised, could not afford to live in it. Cllr Hill has for some time been concerned as to how 'affordable houses' built in Urchfont can be afforded by young families with even an average income.

RH - Concerning access roads to the proposed site at Uphill, he believed these were not adequate for modern day traffic. Although the dimensions of Friars Lane designated it as a 'Lane', it was not used as such anymore and maybe now should be designated as a 'Minimum Road' and given equivalent width?

TH – Had contacted WC to ask if, where the only access to a proposed housing development of 9 dwellings is via public roads, could the developer be held responsible for improving those access roads, i.e: the surrounding infrastructures, or would that be the responsibility of WC Highways? Their reply was that they needed a full Highways report before the planning dept could make a decision. TH felt UPC is at a great disadvantage not knowing what that impact statement will say.

DM – UPC should strongly point out that pedestrian and vehicular safety on Friars Lane & Crooks Lane are paramount and the provision of footpaths and practical road widths should have been addressed when would be repaired and financed by the developer.

Foxley Fields was developed.

Both **RH&LC** hoped and expected that, once all construction was complete, any damage to roads and infrastructure **LC** – This planning proposal was having, and would continue to have, such an impact on the community and LC was of the opinion that UPC cannot and should not support it.

TH – agreed with LC in that having parking restrictions in place for the 12 weeks of initial construction was totally unworkable and an imposition on the residents of Crooks Lane and Foxley Fields.

DM – Agrees with the traffic management brief in that speed limits are 30 mph and that needs to be addressed by Highways, as does the persistent flooding at the junction of Friars & Crooks Lane and in the By-way; both of which are of major concern.

TH – Considering all the obvious problems he felt the Traffic Management Plan was not very imaginative. Any developer of this site should spend time ensuring that it was a workable management plan for both site traffic and the surrounding residential areas.

Drainage and sewage strategies, percolation tests to accommodate SuDS; all these concerns have been raised by the public but UPC cannot provide answers, or indeed make an informed decision, until it has been provided by WC with the explanatory documentation to enable this.

DM – Although they have not yet been posted on the planning website, Highways and Archaeology reports will be made, or already have been, to the planners, as will the Wessex Water report on the drainage.

TH – WC can get all these plans/strategies/statistics sooner than the public and Parish Council and it is not helpful that UPC does not, at this time, have these to hand.

***PW** - It is Wessex Water's statutory duty to provide adequate sewage drainage for the number of houses erected on any new development (or indeed if the sewage from existing houses increases); it is also their duty to provide sewage treatment. WC sorted out problems with the drainage at The Bottom, Urchfont. At present, the run-off from the Foxley Fields estate provides about 1% of the water that runs to The Bottom; the rest is floodwater from the Plain and the fields. All new driveways must be permeable and allow water to run through and soak away. All house run-offs must now feed to soakaways and not to the drains.

GD –Believes that UPC is disadvantaged in not having the relevant information to support this application.

TH – The planning committee now need to move forward and proposed that UPC submit to WC an Objection to this application and include its (and the public's) concerns.

*Cllrs then debated which concerns were important and relevant.

GD – Was concerned that UPC seemed to be drawing up a shopping list of concerns to send back to WC.

*There being a lack of agreement, the Chair proposed that 4 Cllrs repair to the Conference Room to decide upon the formal and final wording to return to the assigned Planning Officer. A vote would then be taken upon their return.

* Cllr. Mottram adjourned the planning meeting:-

Cllrs: **GD/TH/GC/RH** left the Hall, accompanied by **SJ**, at approx 8.12 pm.

The 4 councillors and the planning administrator returned to the main hall at 8.25 pm.

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

*Councillor Hill Proposed a response to the WC Planning Officer as follows;

Planning Application 18/06977/FUL-

The Planning Committee of Urchfont Parish Council **OBJECT** to this application for the following reasons;

UPC objects on the grounds that the UPC Planning Committee has insufficient information to enable support of it. The UPC believes that more detailed reports need to be made available on how the following issues will be addressed:-

- Infrastructure
- Surface Water
- Sewage
- Access / Highway Safety
- Pedestrian Safety
- Pavements on approach roads
- Highway maintenance
- Construction traffic access
- Resident parking during construction

In addition, with respect to Affordable Housing, UPC further believe there should be more units than are currently proposed and that the applicants should submit a more detailed report on how these affordable houses will be managed to meet the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework for Affordable Housing.

*Proposal Seconded by Councillor Day and passed by 8 supporting votes to 1 abstention (PC).

Cllr Hill thanked all present and, there being no other business,
Closed the Planning Meeting at 8:25 pm

***NB: Post meeting comment / additional information**

In answer to a request made by a member of the public, Urchfont Parish Council asked that Councillor Philip Whitehead 'Call In' planning application 18/06977/FUL to WC. Councillor Whitehead confirmed that he would do so.

The proposed date of the next UPC Planning Meeting is **Wednesday 12 September 2018 at 7:00 pm** in the Conference Room of Urchfont Village Hall.

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 on www.wiltshire.gov.uk

Signed Date