

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF URCHFONTS PARISH COUNCIL
held on Wednesday 08 November 2017 at 7:00 pm in the Conference Room of Urchfont
Village Hall...**

****At item C on the Full Council meeting agenda.**

Present: UPC Chair Dave Mottram (DM) Lead of Planning Trevor Hill (TH) Vice-Chair Graham Day (GD) Graham Creasey (GC), Bill Donald (BD) Richard Hawkins (RH) Maria Kemp (MK) Nicky Mitchell (NM) David Stevens (DS) Royston Thomas (RT) Planning Administrator Sandra Johnston (SJ)

Also present: Wiltshire Cllr Philip Whitehead (PW) UPC Clerk Bob Lunn (BL)

Members of the public: Mr A Everett (applicant 5b) Mrs P Banwell (applicant 5c) Mr B Toogood (agent 5c) and 6 members of the public.

1. Apologies for absence: Cllr: Cowen (LC)

2. Declarations of Interest: The applicant acting as legal adviser to UPC, all Council members would declare a non-pecuniary interest in 5b). Being a near neighbour, Cllr Day declared a non-pecuniary interest in 5d).

3. Minutes of a meeting held on 18 October 2017: An alteration was made at item 5b) *17/08934/TCA – 'inherited'* was substituted for *'had planted'*. The minutes were then signed as a true record: proposed by Cllr Day; seconded by Cllr Mitchell; agreed unanimously.

4. Matters arising from those Minutes: None.

Plans for discussion

Council Members were reminded by Cllr Hill that when considering planning applications they must follow the guidance outlined 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: The meeting will be adjourned at the beginning of each Planning Application to enable members of the Public to express their views on that particular application.

Councillor Hill welcomed members of the public and explained procedure regarding public speaking at an Urchfont PC planning meeting.

5. Plans for discussion

5a) 17/09665/TCA - Works to Trees in a Conservation Area to consist of; 1 x Yew tree – reduce by 25% and 1 x Conifer – crown raise to 5.2m above road: all at Church Farm House, Peppercombe lane, Urchfont, Wilts., SN10 4QR, for Mr Robert Pendry.

*To date, no letters of representation had been received by WC Planning Office and/or UPC.

Site viewed on Saturday 04/11/17 by 9 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/LC/GC/RH/MK/NM/DS/RT) & S Johnston.

The Planning Committee found as follows:

- Reducing the Yew is necessary as it is close to the house and its branches are lying on the thatch.
- The Conifer is not a native species. It has been in situ a long time and is quite large. Its spread also interferes with passing traffic, especially hay wagons.
- **DM** - concerned that crown raising the Conifer would result in the tree resembling a large 'lollipop'.

17/09665/TCA - Cllr: Hill proposed that UPC Planning Committee return **No Objection** to this application: Seconded by Cllr Thomas; motion passed unanimously.

5b) 17/09843/TCA - Works to Trees in a Conservation Area to consist of; 1 x Cherry tree – Fell: 1 x Birch tree – Fell: 2 x Sorbus – Fell: all at Cuckoo Farmhouse, Cuckoo Corner, Urchfont, Wilts., SN10 4RA, for Mr Alistair Everett.

*To date, no letters of representation had been received by WC Planning Office and/or UPC.

Site viewed on Saturday 04/11/17 by 9 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/LC/GC/RH/MK/NM/DS/RT) & S Johnston.

Mr Everett was present to explain the proposal and answer any questions.

The Planning Committee found as follows:

- UPC considered this to be sensible housekeeping of small trees. No objections from neighbours.
- WC Arboriculturalist will obviously make the final decision on this proposal.

17/09843/TCA - Cllr: Mottram proposed that UPC Planning Committee return **No Objection** to this application: Seconded by Cllr Hawkins; motion passed unanimously.

5c) 17/09964/FUL - Full Planning Application for the erection of a proposed Dwelling with associated works, on Land at The Bottom, Urchfont, Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4SD, for Mrs Pat Banwell.

*To date, 2 letters of representation had been received by WC Planning Office and/or UPC.

Site viewed on Saturday 04/11/17 by 9 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/LC/GC/RH/MK/NM/DS/RT) & S Johnston.

**The Planning meeting was adjourned for public participation:-

Statement given by Mrs Pat Banwell – Applicant

Mrs Banwell grew up in Urchfont and married there. The land at The Bottom has belonged to her family for many years but, since Mrs Banwell moved from the area, she has found the land increasingly difficult to manage and would like to see what is virtually waste ground being improved and put to better use.

TH Q: Did Mrs Banwell intend to move into the proposed dwelling?

Mrs Banwell replied that she herself had no intention of moving back to Urchfont but a daughter might wish to.

Statement given by Brian Toogood – Acting for applicant Mrs Banwell.

As at noon today only one letter of representation has been received and posted on Wiltshire Council's web site: that representation being in favour of the application. However, nine people were invited by the Planning Officer to make comment by 15/11 so there could therefore be further representations.

One item that was raised in 2014 was the concern regarding flooding. I did not mention this in the Design and Access Statement as I considered the matter had been covered in the last application.

I would advise that flooding will be negated by discharging rainwater from the dwelling and from the terrace into an underground harvester tank. The water will be dispersed by land drains laid in a herringbone pattern to allow the water to percolate through the soil and the orchard to slowly discharge into the adjacent stream. This is in fact shown on drawing No 04.

I approached the local Councillor Philip Whitehead who advised me that he is prepared to support the application. I also approached Councillor Richard Gamble who serves on the Eastern Area Planning Committee and he advised me that he would expect the decision to be made at Officer level but that he would get involved if the application was referred to the Planning Committee. Councillor Gamble also drew my attention to the fact that the Planning Committee will not necessarily accept the Neighbourhood Plan as the ultimate policy and that consideration should be given to points raised by the WC Planners to the last application: That is... 1) *Sustainability* and 2) *Possible detriment to the visual amenities of the area*.

Both of these items have to a degree been covered in the Design and Access Statement. However should UPC tonight vote to support this application I would ask you to consider requesting your secretary to include the following;

*UPC Planning Committee would consider the proposal '*Sustainable*' for the following reasons:

The site is within the village boundary / Services (water, electricity and sewers) are available adjacent the site / The road now has a 20mph speed limit / The proposed dwelling is in comfortable walking distance of the village centre (Village Hall, Church, Shop, Pub, and School) and of the B3098 where public transport is available to cities such as Bath, Salisbury and Swindon. A Community Bus may be available to transport villagers to Devizes and other locations.

* UPC Planning Committee would consider the proposal NOT to be '*detrimental to the visual amenities of the area*' for the following reasons:

The site is covered with weeds and brambles and is not visually attractive / The unmaintained hedge at the top of the bank will be brought back under control to facilitate future maintenance / The proposed soft landscaping of trees and hedges within the site will enhance visual amenity. Thank you.

**Public participation was closed and the planning meeting re-opened:

One letter of representation, from Mary Camden, had been received by UPC Planning Administrator;

Statement by Mary Camden - near neighbour. Read by **SJ** as requested....

"The Lay-by - Given the topography of the area and the narrowness of the lanes, I am concerned at the plans for a lay-by right on the curve of the road junction. This is the exact spot where my car was a write-off following a head-on collision some years ago. I am unaware of the purpose of this lay-by but surely any vehicles parked there would be in danger of opening their doors, or pulling out, into the face of traffic heading downhill from Foxley Fields. If the lay-by is intended to accommodate delivery vehicles then their larger size will only increase the risks.

The Landscape Plan - Several new apple trees are shown in the landscaping plan at the site of two existing, mature beech trees. Can we be reassured that these beech trees will not be cut down? They are noticeably missing on the landscaping plan". Mary Camden, Rose Cottage, The Bottom, Urchfont.

The Planning Committee found as follows:

TH – Explained that this development had been the subject of previous planning applications in 2014, when WC Planning refused it as being outside of the limits of the Urchfont development area. The 'made' UWLNP now changes that position, having changed the development boundary to include this site. UPC supported the previous application but with a condition regarding their concerns relating to the run-off of surface water.

DM – An extra house on this piece of neglected land would improve the locality and the design of the building is more in keeping with the neighbourhood; it being comparable to Orchard Cottage, opposite The Lamb. The latest application also addresses previous concerns over surface water, as explained earlier by Mr Toogood. Although previous measures taken by WC had much improved the control of water flowing to and through the Bottom, due to the fears of close neighbours regarding a possible repeat of flooding issues on their properties, UPC would seek assurance from WC that the water scheme had been thoroughly reviewed.

GD – Understood that there had been no repeat instances of flooding over the past two winters.

BD – As pointed out in Simon Holt's letter of representation on the WC planning website, this site was the 3rd most popular site of those described to members of the public during the UWLNP Public Consultations.

TH – Opined that this site is one of the 9 supported developments within the N.Plan and he had no objection to the site being built on, but should UPC not be seeking to build dwellings which meet the principles, objectives and policies of the N.Plan? Instead of one large house, this site should be used to build two smaller cottages such as 2 x two bedroom semi-detached cottages more in keeping with the objectives of the ULWNP and in keeping with the size and proportions of other properties in this area.

NM Believes the plot is not large enough for 2 houses. **GD** Access is tight.

RH - Still not getting any 2 bedroom houses being built, despite this being recommended in the UWLNP. The NP says that this site is suitable for 'approximately' 1 house. The word 'approximately' was inserted for all sites by the examiner This is not a large site but it is large enough to take two 2 bedroom houses or 2 bed semi-detached. He opined that, during pre-neighbourhood plan consultation, the public was led to believe they would see smaller scale houses being built in Urchfont for younger families looking to purchase their first home and older people wishing to 'down size'. UPC needs to push now for smaller properties to be built.

DM - Contended that, in his opinion, approximately 1 does not equate to 2 – this would be a 100% increase. Also the UWLNP does not distinguish between 2 and 3 bedroom open market houses.

BD – The ULWNP states a preference for 2 to 3 bedroom houses and he believes it is unrealistic to build 2 bedroom houses these days. The N.Plan could never be prescriptive and UPC is not in a position to tell developers what to do. This untended plot needs to be sorted out: it is an asset and is in our N.Plan.

DM - The proposed positioning of a lay-by, which was the main concern expressed by Ms Camden, could be either a nuisance or a benefit. This depended on the behaviour of delivery drivers. WC Highways Department is in a better position to make this judgement than is UPC.

PW – Would advise speaking with developers before they put their plans in to WC. Opined that if UPC repeatedly objected to 3 bedroom houses, which were then refused by WC, developers would start with 4 - 5 bed proposals, knowing UPC would demand the size of these be reduced.

*Various other councillors expressed views about the application, mostly in support. The general consensus was that the land was unsightly and could be put to better use by developing it for habitation. The design of the dwelling was attractive and, with the lowering of the original ridge height and planting of trees and shrubs, should not be obtrusive.

17/09964/FUL - Cllr: Day proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application: Seconded by Cllr Donald; motion passed with 7 in favour and 2 against: Cllr Hill & Cllr Hawkins.

**After informed debate amongst councillors, Councillor Philip Whitehead (being the WC divisional representative for the parish), offered to monitor the progress of this application and, if he felt the planning officer was considering refusing the application and if UPC so desired, would 'call it in' for consideration by the Area Planning Committee.

DM – Proposed that: Urchfont Parish Council request that Councillor Philip Whitehead 'Monitor the progress of planning application 17/09964/FUL and, if he believed that the planning officer intended to refuse it, be aware that UPC would then wish him to 'call the application in'.

Seconded by Cllr Thomas; motion passed with 7 in favour and 2 against: Cllr Hill & Cllr Hawkins.

5d) 17/10310/106 – Discharge of Planning Obligation secured under S106 agreement pursuant to Planning Application K38253; at Hales Farm, The Green, SN10 4QU [sic] (at The Bungalow, Hales Farm, Crookwood Lane, Urchfont, Wilts., SN10 4RA), for Mr Geoffrey Potter.

*To date, no letters of representation had been received by WC Planning Office and/or UPC.

The site was viewed (and explained by Cllr Hill) on 4/11/17 when 9 Cllrs attended Cuckoo Farmhouse.

The Planning Committee found as follows:

TH – Had sought advice from the assigned Planning Officer, Jonathan James.

In essence this is a variation of the Planning Application approved for the building of this agricultural bungalow in 2000.

The 2000 Application was for an agricultural bungalow under Section 106 and had an additional 'restrictive covenant' applied (Third Schedule – Restriction) "The Owners covenant with WC not to sell lease or otherwise dispose of the Bungalow or any part thereof".

This application is to remove that restrictive covenant. The application in no way affects or takes away the 'Agricultural Tie' placed on the Bungalow under Section 106.

DM – This site is one proposed for development in the UWLNP. The application is a precursor for the separation of the bungalow and the land intended for development.

GD – An absolutely necessary procedure. (GD then declared a non-pecuniary interest, being a neighbour).

17/10310/106 - Cllr: Mottram proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application: Seconded by Cllr Donald; motion passed unanimously.

6. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council since 13 October 2017

6a) 17/07508/FUL & 17/07983/LBC - Full Planning Application for the installation of an air-conditioning system / Externally mounted heat-exchanger, in the Urchfont Community Shop The Green, Urchfont, Devizes, SN10 4QU for Mr Bob Lunn. **Approve with Conditions**

6b) 17/09360/TCA - Works to Trees in a Conservation Area to consist of Crown reducing 1 no Ash Tree by 30% - Crown reducing 1 no Lime Tree by 30% - Crown reducing 1 no Liquidamber by 25%; all at Lydgate Farm, High Street, Wedhampton, Devizes SN10 3QE, for Mr Higgins. **No Objection**

7. Matters for Report – None.

There being no other business, the Planning Meeting closed at 7:38 pm.

The proposed date of the next Planning Meeting is **Wednesday 13 December 2017 at 7:00 pm** in Urchfont Village Hall.

Planning Administrator [Sandra Johnston](mailto:sandra-johnston@urc.gov.uk) – 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' – 'application number.'

Signed

Date

