

DRAFT Minutes of the meeting of Urchfont Parish Council (UPC) Planning Meeting held on Wednesday 9th January 2019 in the Village Hall (Main Hall).

Present: Councillors: Day (GD – Chairman), Mitchell (NM – Vice Chairman), Cowen (LC), Kemp (MK), Creasey (GC), Cottell (PC), Hill (TH) and Cottle (SC)

Clerk to the Council: Lunn (BL)

Councillor for Urchfont & The Cannings: Whitehead (PW)

Members of the Public (for all or part of the meeting): Peter Cook, Martin Wingent, Nicky Hammond, Gill Hill, Kit Dark, Anne & Keith Moore, Dana Cooper, Paul Everson, Mike Wilmott, Vivian Mottram, Malcolm Smith, Val & Keith Brockie, Sandra & Ian Johnston, John Knight, Pauline & Jim Stevenson, Brian Roberts, Clare Cannon, Nicola Sage, Martin Covington, Peter Bailey, Roy Ellis, Kieren Dobie

1. **Apologies for absence:** Cllr Maria Kemp (MK)
2. **Declarations of Interest** – NM and SC both declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5b
3. **Minutes of a meeting held on 12th December 2018.**

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
To accept and sign the minutes unchanged as a true and accurate record of the meeting	LC	GD	One abstention, remainder AGREED

4. Matters arising from Minutes of 12th December 2018 – for information only

4a. Statement from Chairman and Vice Chairman regarding Item 7b – GD referred to the following statement which appeared on the agenda (also displayed on screen), it was accepted by Council without comment:

"UPC have already confirmed that the meeting with Qdos was not a breach of UPC's Code of Conduct, but an error in not reporting the meeting to Council as quickly as it should have been under the UPC Planning Policy and Procedure. This position is clearly stated in the minutes of the 12th December 2018 meeting as follows:

'GD stated that prior approval for this type of meeting was not required but there is no doubt that DM and BD should have delivered a report on the visit to Qdos at the meeting on 10th October 2018. They had explained and apologised for this omission in an email to Keith Brockie (copied to all councillors) on the 13th October 2018.'

"We are starting a New Year and need to put this issue behind us and deal with the matters in hand. Uphill remains an important subject and we must focus on the revised application."

Graham Day and Nicky Mitchell

4b. Statement received from Bill Donald regarding Item 7b - GD referred to the following statement which appeared on the agenda (also displayed on screen), it was accepted by Council without comment:

"Contrary to Mr Malcolm Smith's statement at the Parish Council meeting on 12th December, I did not resign as a result of the meeting Councillor Mottram and I held with Qdos. While I accept that some UPC rules in respect of internal council communication were not followed, it was an action that was only taken with the best intentions with an aim to benefit the parish. It remains my belief that any misdemeanour here did not require me to resign, but only to offer an explanation and apology for which I have already delivered."

Bill Donald (29th December 2018)

4c. Planning Application 18/09099/FUL & 18/09169/LBC Old School House – TH reported that he had written to WC Planning expressing disappointment that UPC had not had the opportunity to further consult on this controversial application because an extension of the comments deadline had been refused.

5. Plans for discussion

5a. 18/6977/FUL - Revised proposal - Erection of 8 dwellings at Uphill, Urchfont

GD assured the audience that they should assume that all councillors had read submitted letters of representation received by UPC to date. Furthermore, UPC was adapting its processes for consideration of planning applications in line with WC changes. All parishioners are encouraged to submit letters of representation to the WC website as soon as possible since UPC councillors rely on a late check prior to our scheduled meeting as one means of gauging public opinion. Notwithstanding this, the invitation to deliver a personal message via public participation at UPC remains open.

The Chairman closed the meeting for public participation

Nicola Sage – whilst accepting that her point was not directly and solely related to this application, she wondered how UPC will in future ensure more affordable houses are available in the Parish. Will UPC put forward the case when the next Neighbourhood Plan is prepared for publication in 2026? She now lives in social housing in Foxley Fields, but may have to move and may not have the opportunity to gain alternative affordable housing in Urchfont.

Malcolm Smith – expressed the view that WC appears to think that Neighbourhood Plans are a licence to build houses without infrastructure improvements. However, the UWLNP includes some very useful sections including Policy TIC1 on the provision of necessary infrastructure and access to the B3098. He suggested that UPC need to object to this application on the basis that it does not satisfy this requirement.

Jim Stevenson – confirmed that he had objected to the original application, but none of his concerns had been addressed by the revised application. In particular he is concerned about the inadequacy of roads leading to the site and the position of the entrance which is at the junction with four other roads. He reiterated his previously expressed view that there are other more suitable sites within the Parish which are not in the UWLNP, including opposite Ballingers and at the junction of Crooks Lane with the B3098. Farmers Field was bequeathed for the benefit of the community, it would seem to be an ideal site for several affordable houses even if they are of the semi-mobile home type such as at Clock Inn.

The Chairman re-opened the Council meeting

TH reported that UPC had received 10 letters of objection (names displayed on screen) regarding this revised application plus one noted as having gone direct to the WC Website, this in addition to the 42 representation letters already on the WC Planning website relating to the original application. Of all these only two letters from one individual support the application(s), the rest object to one degree or another. An analysis of the reasons for objection shows that most have not been addressed by the revised application (e.g. inadequate roads, parking restrictions during development works, ridge heights higher than surrounding). A site visit had been made by 7 councillors on the 8th January 2019 (site visit report completed), Roy Ellis had kindly facilitated access to the site.

GD expressed three concerns as follows:

- Process – GD was disappointed that the revised plans appear under the same application reference as the original. He found it impossible to identify what interaction had taken place between WC and the developer and if WC was acting to obtain mitigating benefits for Urchfont residents it was not possible to ascertain what these benefits are.
- Within Plot – he was disappointed with the reduction of affordable houses
- Outside Plot – The two WC Highways reports on the website appear to contradict each other, and the last one is dated 31st October 2018. He wondered whether WC had actually requested the developer to provide any road / pavement improvements.

PC took the view that the size of the proposed development will hardly exacerbate the already dangerous traffic / pedestrian scenario in Crooks Lane etc. Mike Wilmott had already stated at the FC meeting today that a developer is not responsible for infrastructure outside of his site, why is WC not recognising and addressing the dangers on this stretch of road which already exist. LC believed that the developer should be involved in infrastructure improvements and wondered why UPC had not been involved in any interaction between WC and the developer. NM questioned the reduction in affordable homes, it is significant, and why had the developer not consulted UPC on these revised plans? NM also believed UPC needs to influence improvements to the road / pavement situation in Crooks Lane. SC expressed the view that the

proposed entrance to the site is dangerous for both vehicles and traffic as it is at the junction of 4 other roads, he also expressed disappointment at the loss of an affordable house.

TH acknowledged that whilst some of the concerns expressed previously by UPC had been addressed by specialist officer reports, others had not. He pointed out that the made UWLNP is a legal document which talks about 30% of a development over 5 houses being affordable, why has this not been followed in this case? He believed that ridge height and visual impact is still an issue and overall believed that UPC should still object to this revised application.

PW confirmed that the application remains 'called in' and will go to the EAPC in due course, probably 31st January. A maximum of 3 supporters and 3 objectors plus a UPC representative will be allowed to speak at the EAPC, it is important that each speaker for and against covers different aspects to maximize the opportunity.

In concluding the debate on this application, GD emphasized that any response to WC must concentrate on accepted planning issues. The following proposal was then made:

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	Resolution
<p>The Planning Committee of Urchfont Parish Council OBJECT to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed application does not address the necessary road infrastructure improvements and enhancements for pedestrian and vehicle safety (along its main access route to and from the B3098), to sufficiently support this development. (*UWLNP Policy TIC1 1(a)) •The number of Affordable houses has been reduced from 3 to 2. Development proposals of more than 5 properties are expected to deliver at least 30% (net) Affordable Houses. (*UWLNP Policy H3 (1)) •The proposed entrance layout to the site, at a junction of 4 existing roads, does not allow safe movement of pedestrians and vehicles with priority to pedestrians. (*UWLNP Policy D1 (e)) • The ridge height of proposed houses, are at least 2metres above those of houses in the immediate area, and as such does not respect the visual impact upon the existing rural locality and reflect local distinctiveness. (*UWLNP Policy D1 (a)) <p>(*Urchfont Wedhampton Lydeaway Neighbourhood Plan – UWLNP)</p>	TH	LC	Unanimously Agreed

GD commented that UPC now need to prepare for the EAPC meeting, both he and TH would attend. It was agreed that TH would draft and seek approval for the case to be presented.

ACTION: FC/01/19 - TH

5b. 18/11801/TCA – Works to trees at 2 Oakston, High Street, Urchfont for Mr Wingent – TH reported that a site visit had been made (and a site visit report submitted) by 7 councillors on 8th January 2019 and that no representations appear on the WC website. GD commented that this application appeared perfectly reasonable and that he would support.

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	Resolution
NO OBJECTION	TH	GC	Unanimously AGREED

6. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council since 6th December 2018

6a. **18/10828/TCA** Fell 2 Leylandii (T1 & T2) at Chestnut Cottage, Wedhampton - **No Objection**

6b. **18/09099/FUL & 18/09169/LBC** – Single storey extension to existing dwelling The Old School House. Addition of doors to existing open store with decking above (Amended Plans) - **Approved with conditions**

7. Matters for Report

7a. **Minutes of the Planning Meeting 10th October 2018 – Item 7 Matters for Report – Uphill Application 18/06977/FUL** – statement included in the agenda for this meeting:

Councillor Mottram sent the following request in an email to Graham Day, copied to all councillors, the Clerk, the Planning Administrator and Councillor Whitehead on the 23rd October 2018. To date the request in the second paragraph has not been discussed or an amendment to the minutes made. At the FC meeting on 12th December 2018 (Minutes Item 17c), it was suggested that this should be documented as a statement rather than subject of discussion due to the time lapse since the October meeting and the fact that it is not appropriate to change minutes which have already been approved.

"There is one omission I would like to be added to these minutes. Immediately after Jim Stevenson's 'wrong end of the stick' comment, Graham Day stated that UPC will object. I don't recall the exact words, but feel this comment should be minuted. There is also no mention in the minutes that I had opened up discussions with the Snook family about improvements along Crooks Lane."

7b. **Application 18/11951/FUL – Replace existing flat roof and extend garage – 16 The Paddock** – TH reported that UPC may need to convene an interim meeting before the 13th February to consider this application because an extension of the consultation date requested by BL had been refused despite the fact that:

- Although the application was registered on 18th December 2018, there was no public manifestation of this
- It was not included in the weekly list of new applications for the period 15th December to 4th January 2019 issued on 7th January 2019
- UPC were not notified of the consultation period until 8th January 2019
- No documents appeared on the WC website on the 8th or 9th January

LC asked whether a decision could be taken at a site visit or by email, TH advised that neither of these methods would allow public interaction / consultation.

PW expressed the view that this rejection is not acceptable and suggested that it should be the subject of further challenge to the Case Officer, copied to him to follow up.

ACTION: FC/02/19 – BL

7c. **Difference between social and affordable housing** – PW advised councillors that the definition for these two types of housing differ as follows:

- Affordable – houses rented out or sold at less than market value (normally around 80%)
- Social – these are council houses, most of which have been transferred to housing associations, rented out or sold to tenants on a 'right to buy' basis. Unusually compared to other Authorities, Wiltshire still does have around 5000 council houses and are still building new council houses in small numbers.

The scheduled date for the next Planning Meeting is **Wednesday 13th February 2019 at 7:00 pm** in Urchfont Village Hall.

Draft minutes prepared by the Clerk to the Council - 11th January 2019