

DRAFT Minutes of the Urchfont Parish Council (UPC) Planning Meeting held on Wednesday 11th March 2020 in the Village Hall.

Present: Councillors: Day (GD – Chairman), Hill (TH), Cottell (PC), Kemp (MK), Hollyman (MH), Cottle (SC), Kinnaird (LK)

Clerk to the Council: Lunn (BL)

Councillor for Urchfont & The Cannings: Whitehead (PW)

Members of the Public (for all or part of the meeting): Mr Roy Ellis, Mr Peter Bailey, Mr Alistair Everett, Mr Nigel Fowler, Mrs J Ciappi, Ms N Hammond, Mr Malcolm Taylor, Mr & Mrs Lee Acton, Mr Steven Arnott, Ms E Burrows, Mr Malcolm Smith

1. **Apologies** – Cllrs Botham, Cowen, Creasey and Stevens
2. **Declarations of Interest** – GD declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5a
3. **Minutes of a meeting held on 12th February 2020**

| Proposal | Proposer | Seconder | Resolution |
|--|----------|----------|--------------------|
| To approve and sign the minutes unchanged as a true and accurate record of the meeting | MK | MH | AGREED Unanimously |

4. **Matters arising from Minutes of 12th February 2020** – None raised

5. **Plans for discussion**

- 5a. **20/01186/TCA – Fell 1 sycamore and 2 Eucalyptus at Cuckoo Farmhouse, Cuckoo Corner, Urchfont, SN10 4RA for Mr Everett.**

Site Visit: 9th March 2020 by 5 councillors

Letters of Representation: None received or appear on WC website

Chairman closed the meeting for public participation

Mr Everett explained that the existing trees are tall, very visible to neighbouring properties and close to his property wall, the sycamore is around 15 to 20 metres high. He has a plan to replace the felled trees with beech and sweet gum trees, he handed out a leaflet describing these and others considered.

Chairman re-opened the Council meeting

TH commented that the sycamore is a multi-stemmed tree, GD stated that he believed the proposal is justified. PC had no objection to the proposal subject to the provision of replacement trees.

| Proposal | Proposer | Seconder | Resolution |
|--|----------|----------|--------------------|
| NO OBJECTION subject to provision of replacement trees | TH | MK | AGREED Unanimously |

- 5b. **20/01251/FUL - Proposed demolition and reconstruction of side extension to form ground floor dining area and enlargement of first floor master bedroom. Conversion of garage to play room and extension of side wall to form larger first floor bedroom and new study to rear. Proposed garden workroom at 5 Manor Close, Urchfont, SN10 4RE for Mr Acton.**

Site Visit: 9th March 2020 by 5 councillors

Letters of Representation: 3 letters of objection on the WC website and also copied to UPC. BL confirmed that all had been distributed to councillors prior to this meeting.

TH explained that this is the second application for this property by Mr Acton, the first having been withdrawn prior to WC consideration and following objection by UPC. GD asked whether this application should be viewed as a new application or an amended version of the original application, TH confirmed that this new application should be considered on its own merits.

Chairman closed the meeting for public participation

Mr Acton explained that prior to submission of this new application he had gained advice from WC Planning and had taken account of comments from neighbours on the first application, not all of which he had agreed with. He had also spoken to neighbours prior to submission of this new application taking particular account of comments on the height of the proposed building in comparison to others, it is a lot lower than the property next door, and the perceived extent of family owned business vehicles parking in the Close. He did not believe that these vehicles would obstruct emergency and/or service vehicles in the Close. He had offered neighbours the opportunity to raise any concerns directly with him and hoped that all this interaction would be taken into account.

Chairman re-opened the Council meeting

TH commented on the site visit during which councillors met and had the opportunity to view the site, seek information from Mr Acton on his proposals and externally view potential impact on neighbouring properties. LK asked whether the proposed works are 2m from the boundary fence, TH believed that it would be between 1 and 2m from fence. MH asked about the impact of surface water.

Chairman closed the meeting for public participation

Mr Acton explained that surface water is and has been an issue with previous development of this area, even after digging over his whole garden he still has lying water. Mr Fowler explained that he had moved into his property 20 years ago, which has a floor slab some 1.3m below 5 and 6 Manor Close, and has subsequently had a 6ft high retaining wall built to compensate for the difference. Additionally he had installed land drainage and a large soak-away several years ago to try and tackle surface water issues. Mr Fowler also commented that other house extensions on the west side of Manor Close had been built at a time when they overlooked trees in what is now the Beeches development and so did not impact on neighbouring households.

Chairman re-opened the Council meeting

TH had no issue with the side extension (to the west), but did have significant issues with the proposed extension at the rear (to the north) overlooking Paddock View which he felt was too high and would have lack of privacy impact on properties in that road. For this reason he could not support the application. LK commented that Mr Acton had indicated that he would take overlooking windows out of the rear extension. GD had been impressed with the extent of research displayed by Mr Acton to try and overcome potential issues, but tended to agree with TH in relation to the proposed rear extension and believed that proposed rear facing windows must be removed. MK was of the view that the whole proposal made the property too large compared to other properties in the area, LK disagreed based on research into neighbouring property sizes undertaken by Mr Acton (distributed to the meeting). Whilst the proposals will increase the size of the property significantly, SC was of the view that a lot of garden space remained in comparison to other properties in the Close.

| Proposal | Proposer | Seconded | Resolution |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| To OBJECT to this application on the basis that the extension to the rear of property is too high and has windows which will unreasonably impact on the privacy of properties in Paddock View. | TH | MK | AGREED Unanimously |

6. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council since 6th February 2020 –

6a. 19/11928/FUL – Demolition of existing garage, proposed rear / side extensions and carport at 1 Walnut Close, Urchfont, SN10 4RU – **APPROVED with conditions**

7. Matters for Report – None reported

The scheduled date for the next Planning Meeting is **Wednesday 8th April 2020 at 7:00 pm** in Urchfont Village Hall.