



**DRAFT Minutes of the Extra-ordinary Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> October 2016 in the Conference Room of Urchfont Village Hall**

**Present: Councillors:** Donald (Chairman – BD), Mitchell (NM), Thomas (RT), Chapman (JC), Day (GD), Stephens (AS), Gibb (HG), Baker (PB) and Hill (TH)

**Clerk to the Council:** Lunn (BL)

**Members of the Public:** Linda Clow, Suzanne & Cliff Gray, Emma Chapman, Gill Hill and Declan Lyttle.

**1. Welcome:** BD acting as Chairman for this meeting welcomed all councillors and members of the public to the meeting. He stated that public participation would normally be restricted to a maximum of 3 minutes per person in accordance with Council Standing Orders, but this could be extended at the Chairman's discretion.

**2. Apologies:** Cllr Mottram (DM) & Planning Administrator S. Johnston (SJ)

**3. Declarations of Interest:** Cllr Stephens (AS): Non-Pecuniary Interest (entitled to speak and vote, but elected not to participate in either)

**4. Planning Application 16/01099/FUL 'The Beeches' Blackboard Lane, SN10 4RD – Appeal by QDOS Homes Ltd homes.** The Chairman confirmed that this meeting was to specifically consider what action the Parish Council should take in response to The Planning Inspectorate letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> September 2016 regarding the above appeal. He suggested that the Council had basically three options:

- A. Make no response
- B. Re-iterate what was said in the 'OBJECT' response to the original application on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2016 and re-iterated in full at an interim planning committee meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2016 (details attached at Appendix 1 – on website only).
- C. Expand on what was said under B above

*The Chairman closed the Council meeting for Public Participation*

**Mrs Linda Clow** – having taken a lot of time to read all the documents associated with this appeal, Mrs Clow stated that she would try to be professional and not emotional in her presentation. She firstly emphasised that people in the community support development of this specific site, but not the size and style of the current proposal. Basically the appeal report by QDOS displays arrogance and seeks to rubbish everything that has been said previously by the Parish Council and wider community, she highlighted the following examples:

- i. that 'The Beeches' and Manor Close are not considered special as they are not in the conservation area
- ii. a completely new reference to the site affording protection of Urchfont Manor
- iii. that the style of houses in Manor Close is out of date having been built in the 1960's

- iv. the assertion that the evolving Neighbourhood Plan (UWLNP) is not applicable
- v. assertion that Manor Close is irrelevant in considering this application, no recognition has been given to the fact that some will be shaded and overlooked by the proposed development

Mrs Clow further stated that she believed the density of the proposed buildings on this site is compromised by the number of trees and questioned the number of separate buildings when this could be reduced by semi-detached rather than detached properties.

**Mr Declan Lyttle** – expressed appreciation for the support of the Parish Council to date and encouraged councillors to re-iterate their 'OBJECT' stance. He also re-iterated the support of the local community for development of this site but that the current proposal for the size and number of the executive style houses is wrong. He further believed that their current proposal is contrary to the quickly evolving Neighbourhood Plan and also the SHLAA.

**Richard Hawkins** (not at the meeting) – BD read out in full a statement from Mr Hawkins which is attached to these minutes at Appendix 2 (on website only).

*The Chairman re-opened the Council Meeting*

GD commented that UPC had previously OBJECTED to this proposal on two previous occasions, he sees nothing in the appeal to change this view. The objective now should be to consider how best to convince the Planning Inspectorate that the appeal should be refused.

Noting the emphasis in the appeal that the evolving Neighbourhood Plan is not applicable, JC asked what the current status of the UWLNP is. The Chairman explained that the expected Fact Sheet had now been received from the Examiner. The Steering Group will review this and make recommendations to UPC to facilitate the required response to Wiltshire Council by Monday 10<sup>th</sup> October. It is not thought that the Fact Sheet raises major issues and so it is hoped that the Plan will move to Referendum stage later this year. BL confirmed that he will be forwarding the Fact Sheet to all councillors requesting comments quickly to inform the Steering Group review. TH referred to the Secretary of State report in October 2014 which overturned the Coate appeal based on the importance of their Neighbourhood plan which was only at Section 14 stage, the UWLNP is already at the later Stage 16 in the process. JC asserted that on this basis the UWLNP cannot be ignored or rubbished at this late stage.

RT asserted that the Council should continue to be positive about development of this site, but not based on the current plan under appeal. He referred to the WC Notification of Refusal document which details very well the reasons for refusal, these align with Council and community comments about the implications of the current development proposal.

GD asked whether the Planning Inspectorate will have seen all previous documents and correspondence in relation to this planning application and its refusal, consensus indicated that they would have seen these documents and their decisions would have to fully comply with Government Policy on planning.

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Proposer</b>	<b>Seconded</b>	<b>Decision</b>
To respond to the Planning Inspectorate by the 14 <sup>th</sup> October deadline confirming earlier UPC 'OBJECT' statements/decisions and to supplement this with key additional points, including the relevance of the UWLNP.	BD	NM	1 abstention, the remainder voted in FAVOUR

It was further agreed that GD would develop a first draft of the response for discussion with TH and RT over the weekend 8<sup>th</sup> / 9<sup>th</sup> October. The final draft will then be subject to an email decision by all councillors on or before 10<sup>th</sup> October. The agreed version in triplicate is to be covered by a letter from the Clerk and despatched by recorded delivery on 11<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> October at the very latest.

BD thanked all members of the public for their attendance and participation, he reminded them that they can write to the Planning Inspectorate individually sending their statement in triplicate to arrive by the deadline of Friday 14<sup>th</sup> October 2016.

The meeting closed at 7.40pm.

Draft minutes prepared by the Clerk to the Council, Bob Lunn.

The next scheduled meeting of the Council will be on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016.

## APPENDIX 1

The following Observations were sent by Urchfont Parish Council to the Planning Officer after application 16/01099/FUL was considered by UPC's Planning Committee on 09/03/2016. These comments were re-iterated in full at an interim planning meeting of UPC on 31/05/2016, after consideration had taken place of amendments made to the original drawings (by Qdos).

Urchfont Parish Council

*For the attention of Jonathan James*

*Planning Application 16/01099/FUL – for the Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of Two three bedroom houses and Two four bedroom houses, with garages and associated works (re-submission of application 15/11645/FUL), all at 'The Beeches', Blackboard Lane, Urchfont, Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4RD.*

*The Planning Committee of Urchfont Parish Council OBJECT to the above application on the following grounds;*

*(The Policy references detailed below are those Policies contained within the Urchfont, Wedhampton and Lydeaway Neighbourhood Plan (UWLNP) which has recently been approved by Urchfont Parish Council and sent to Wiltshire Council)*

- *Policy H1 Housing Site Allocation:- The proposed development only provides 4 houses and not 5 as specified within this Policy.*
- *Policy H2 Form of Housing Development:- Having regard to the type and size of houses expected to be delivered throughout the area covered by the UWLNP and as specified within policy H2, the proposed development does not provide an overall predominance of 2 & 3 bedroom houses, or small scale housing units for older people,*
- *Policy D1 Design – Section 2 (a):- The proposed development does not show a design of appropriate scale, layout and form which reflects local distinctiveness as required by this policy.*

*With regards,*

*Sandra Johnston*

*Planning Administrator for Urchfont Parish Council.*

## APPENDIX 2

I will not be attending the meeting tonight but would like the following statement to be made on my behalf.

In the appeal statement document, Impact Planning Services Ltd, on behalf of QDOS Homes Ltd dismisses the 'Urchfont, Wedhampton and Lydeaway Neighbourhood Plan (2015 – 2026)' stating that *'the emerging Plan cannot be accorded material weight at this stage in its course of formulation and consultation'*. I would argue that our emerging Neighbourhood Plan carries the same, if not more, weight than other Neighbourhood Plans which have been used recently in objections too and refusals of local planning applications.

Our Neighbourhood Plan is a document prepared after detailed consultation with the Urchfont Parish community. The views of the community are clearly stated in the 'Objectives' and 'Housing' sections of the document:

- **Objectives (Page 11)** : *'Seek small scale homes to meet identified local need and to encourage those on median and lower incomes into Urchfont village'*
- **Housing (Pages 15 - 17)** :  
*'It must be well designed and include a range of different types, tenures and sizes with small-scale housing predominant'*.
- *'The requirement for particular housing size and type, including any distinction between flats and houses needs to reflect that of the demonstrable need of the community'*.
- *'Housing size and type will be expected to reflect the community's needs. Evidence has shown that the need of the community is for smaller homes, which are suited to meet the requirements of young families and older people. Therefore, it will be expected that new development proposals will show the largest proportion of homes as 2 and 3 bedroomed. Given the trend of an ageing local population, schemes which provide homes for specifically older people will be supported'*.
- *'Support will be given to development proposals which:*
  - i. *Make efficient use of land.*
  - ii. *Show a predominance of 2 & 3 bedroomed houses and /or include small scale housing units for older people'*.

Even the housing needs survey carried out and detailed in Appendix F (Page 10) of the Neighbourhood Plan identified that *'The need expressed was mainly for two-bedroom properties. No need was expressed for properties with 4 or more bedrooms'*.

Clearly are Neighbourhood Plan is an important document with regard to this development and the proposed plans do not meet with its basic requirements. As I have stated at previous meetings if sites of this size cannot be developed with the types of housing detailed above I cannot see how the 'predominance' of 2 & 3 bedroomed housing detailed in our plan can be achieved.

I would like the Parish Council to reinforce, vigorously, its previous objection statement with regard to this application particularly with regard to the 'weight' which are Neighbourhood Plan should be given.

Richard Hawkins

