

DRAFT Minutes of the Urchfont Parish Council (UPC) Planning Meeting held on Wednesday 12th December 2018 in the Conference Room of Urchfont Village 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): Mr & Mrs Lee, Malcolm Smith, John Knight, Roy Ellis, Patty Frankel, Liz Hornby, Paul Scarffe, Rob Naylor and Di Harris

1. Apologies for Absence: Cllrs Mottram (DM) and Stevens (DS). GD read out a statement from DM:

"Please accept my apologies for not being able to attend the UPC meetings on 12th December. As some of you are already aware, I was disappointed with some of the feedback from the team building event on 28th November. Furthermore, I was astonished by some of the views expressed by the Chairman at a meeting between himself, the Vice-Chairman, the Parish Clerk, and myself on 7th December. Give my current state of mind, I don't believe that I would be able to make a positive contribution to the meeting, and this could further damage the apparently tarnished reputation of UPC."

2. **Declarations of Interest:** None declared at the meeting

3. **Minutes of a meeting held on 14th November 2018:**

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
To accept and sign the minutes unchanged as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	LC	SC	Unanimously Agreed

4. **Matters arising from those Minutes** – None raised

5. **Plans for discussion**

5a) 18/10828/TCA Fell 2 Leylandii (T1 & T2) at Chestnut Cottage, Wedhampton for Mrs Robinson

No letters of representation had been received. TH stated that no site visit had been made on this occasion, councillors relied on the planning application on the WC website and also a site visit made in June 2018 to view a number of trees which were the subject of an earlier application. The site itself has difficult access off the A342 and was accessed on the last occasion via a footpath to the back of the property. TH expressed the view that this is a very logical application, he had been surprised that these trees had not been included in the earlier application.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
NO OBJECTION	TH	GC	Unanimously Agreed

5b) 18/10675/FUL - Single Storey extension to dwelling at 14 Manor Close, Urchfont for Mrs Hornby

No letters of representation had been received. Although present, Mrs Hornby declined the offer to speak. TH commented on a successful site visit earlier today by six councillors (Site Visit Report completed). The application retains the slightly reduced footprint of the existing garage to sensibly facilitate a new kitchen / dining room with no impact on neighbouring properties. Both NM and GD commented that this was a very good proposal / plan.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
SUPPORT	TH	NM	Unanimously Agreed

5c) 18/09932/FUL Creation of off street parking area (retrospective), replace existing windows and door on front elevation, new French windows on gable elevation at Yew Tree Cottage, The Bottom, Urchfont for Mr Hazell

No letters of representation had been received. TH stated that a useful site meeting had taken place today when five councillors met Mr Hazell (Site Visit Report completed). He further commented that this application is in two parts, parking area (retrospective) and modifications to windows / doors. LC commented that the plans make a great deal of sense and he saw no reason to object, off street parking area is a very good idea to keep cars off the narrow road. NM agreed with LC comments. TH commented that new wooden windows would replace UPVC. The new French window in the gable end would provide additional light to this small property.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
SUPPORT	TH	MK	Unanimously Agreed

5d) 18/11512/TCA T1 Mulberry Tree – Reduce by 10-15%, T2 Yew Tree – cut back to boundary at St Michaels Church, Urchfont for Mrs Harding.

No letters of representation had been received. TH commented that whilst the application was submitted by Mrs Harding, it is fully supported by the Church Warden in relation to the yew tree in church grounds which overhangs Mulberry House garden. A site visit was undertaken today by five councillors (Site Visit Report completed) which noted that both trees show signs of previous pruning. The application makes a lot of sense.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
NO OBJECTION	TH	SC	Unanimously Agreed

6. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council since 05 October 2018

6a) 18/07934/FUL Partial Demolition and construction of existing building at Beech House, High Street, Urchfont
Approve with conditions

6b) 18/08261/LBC Partial Demolition and reconstruction of existing building at Beech House, High Street, Urchfont.
Approve

6c) 18/08859/FUL erection of lean-to greenhouse at Hartley House, Blackboard Lane, Urchfont
Approve with conditions

6d) 18/09775/TCA re-pollard 1 Ash Tree (T1) and 2 Willow Trees (T2 & T3) at Willow Gate, Urchfont

No Objection

7. Matters for Report

7a) 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) – this application was considered at the meeting on 10th October 2018 and gained a SUPPORT decision. A subsequent objection by Mr & Mrs Lee (immediate neighbour) on 24th October initiated a planning officer site visit and call for amended plans. These plans have now been received and the Planning Officer has initiated a further consultation period ending on 6th December 2018. A requested extension of this date to 13th December 2018 to facilitate further Council discussion at this meeting was rejected. In view of this the Council has had no alternative but to submit NO COMMENT in relation to this additional consultation request.

TH read out the above background statement and noted that WC Planning Approval with conditions had been granted on 10th December 2018.

The Chairman closed the meeting for Public Participation

Mr Lee commented that he and his wife had been unaware that a UPC site visit had taken place in early October and that the application had subsequently been discussed at the Council meeting on 10th October 2018 which generated a SUPPORT decision. The then UPC Planning Administrator had not notified Mr & Mrs Lee of the impending site visit or the fact that the application was on the October meeting agenda. Mr Lee believed that the agent had given the Council misleading statements on the site visit and at the meeting, the planning consultants had been very careful not to discuss their proposals with the Lees household. Mr Lee further stated that whilst WC had received his significant and detailed objections on 24th October, he did not believe that they had fully taken all of these into account when making their decision and referenced prior work to The Old School House which had not necessarily been carried out in compliance with conditions (e.g. windows overlooking Two Chimneys). He felt that the WC planning process is flawed and that his objections had not been given serious consideration. Mrs Lee added that the applicants had only originally asked about a toilet in the

extension, which the Lee's had accepted. The UPC minutes of 10th October clearly state that councillors were not satisfied with some of the explanations offered by the agent, why then did UPC SUPPORT the application at that time? GD commented that he had sympathy with the concerns raised by Mr & Mrs Lee and was amazed when the normally accommodating WC Planning Dept rejected the Council request to extend the consultation deadline to facilitate discussion of the amended plans at this meeting. He asked Mr Lee whether WC had originally notified him of the application and consultation periods, Mr Lee responded that they had. It was suggested that Mr & Mrs Lee should now write to WC Planning again to outline their significant concerns and disappointment with the planning approval, PW asked for this to be copied to him so that he can discuss the issues with Planning (although not offering any guarantee his interaction would result in change). GD asked for this to also be copied to UPC for the record. It was also agreed that TH would write to WC expressing UPC disappointment that they had not had the opportunity to discuss this application further in the light of significant objections from the immediate neighbour.

ACTION: FC/117/18 – TH

Whilst not specifically relating to this application, Rob Naylor highlighted the fact that owners of the Old School House had disregarded planning approval conditions for an earlier retrospective application relating to a structure that adjoins / overhangs his property (The Grain Store). On UPC advice he had written to WC to point out that planning approval was being disregarded in relation to the roof height in particular, but the WC Enforcement Officers considered that there had only been a minor infringement and would not take any action. Mr Naylor posed the question, how much can you disregard planning approvals without fearing enforcement action? He wondered whether the owners of the Old School House would similarly disregard the planning approval and conditions for this current application which impacts on Two Chimneys! PW expressed the view that he found the response by WC Enforcement on the earlier application unacceptable due to the fact that the application had been retrospective and should reflect the actual roof heights etc. as built, PW asked Mr Naylor to write to him on the subject and he will review with the Planning Department.

The Chairman re-opened the Council meeting.

7b) 18/06977/FUL – Erection of Nine Dwellings together with associated works on land at Uphill – this application was due to be presented to the Eastern Area Planning Committee on 1st November 2018, it was withdrawn because more work needed to be undertaken by WC Planning Officers. A retrospective visit report on a meeting with Qdos Homes on 8th October 2018 by Councillors Mottram and Donald has been distributed to all councillors with this agenda. At the request of the Clerk, the following status report has been received from the WC Case Officer:

"The assessment of the application is ongoing at present. The applicants' consultants are currently considering the comments made by consultees and interested parties and may submit a revised scheme for consideration in due course. If / when a revised scheme or new information is submitted there will be a re-consultation exercise to allow all interested parties an opportunity to comment on the revised application. A re-consultation exercise is usually 14 days but will obviously be extended if it coincides with the Christmas holiday period.

The next Eastern Area Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for the 3rd January 2018. The application is unlikely to be ready to be presented early in the New Year. The next meeting is scheduled for the 31st January which is a possibility. Once the applicant's planning consultant clarifies their position and proposed approach I'll have a better idea of the likely determination date and will let you know."

TH read out the above background information which was also displayed on screen. Although present, Roy Ellis (Joint Applicant) declined the offer to speak on this application.

The Chairman closed the meeting for public participation.

Malcolm Smith thanked Simon Holt for responding with answers to the questions posed in his email of 7th December which he intended to ask tonight in relation to the visit made to Qdos by DM and Bill Donald (BD). He then read out an extract from the UPC Planning Procedures which clearly state that visits should not be made without Council prior approval. TH commented that the UPC procedures had been re-drafted by DM, Simon Holt and himself and approved in June 2016 (corrected to 9th March 2016 post meeting), these had taken some 3 months to prepare and were quite clear on the visit and report rules to be applied. The Policy was further updated to its current version in July 2017 to reflect the fact that the neighbourhood plan had been 'made'. 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. Malcolm Smith stated that in that email DM had said that he felt intimidated and BD said that he had forgotten to report, this is hardly acceptable. Malcolm Smith asked for a copy of the delayed Visit / Meeting Report, GD explained that this is normally an internal document but as it is not confidential it would be made available with the

minutes (Appendix on website only). Referring to his question 3 in which he had referred to the Qdos meeting as clandestine, Mr Smith accepted that this may not be the correct word but that the meeting was nevertheless undertaken without the knowledge of other councillors or indeed anybody else. He considered this to be disgraceful behaviour on the part of councillors, BD at least did the right thing and resigned.

Mr Smith then turned to his question 5 about similar meetings which may have taken place in relation to the Beeches development, the answer 'no' had been given but he found this difficult to believe. TH pointed out that earlier versions of UPC Planning Procedures were in place when the first Beeches application was discussed in March 2016 and that the Procedures version approved on 9th March 2016 applied from then on. Mr Smith considered the behaviour of DM and BD appalling with regard to admitted and suspected relationships with Qdos over these two developments and requested that the Council condemn DM for his behaviour.

The Chairman re-opened the Council meeting.

TH suggested that the best way forward might be to give DM the opportunity to explain and defend his actions and intentions in this respect at the January 2019 meeting, GD added that Council declined Mr. Smith's request to condemn DM at this meeting. LC stated that he did not wish to exacerbate the situation but he is getting sick and tired of being put in the position of having to defend fellow councillors, the matter is getting out of hand. Council need to condemn actions which might have taken place contrary to procedures, but not necessarily particular councillor(s). GD agreed to include this issue in the January 2019 meeting agenda, Council members have already committed themselves to working together and adhering to policies and procedures in future. Whilst she did not attend the 10th October meeting, NM agreed that DM and BD did not do the right thing by not reporting the meeting with Qdos but she noted that from the minutes that the 10th October meeting got very heated and debate on this issue was not completed. NM believed that DM and BD had undertaken the meeting with Qdos with the very best intentions to seek improvements to this particular application which then might be more acceptable to the community, their error was just the fact that they did not report it when they should. Looking forward, GD reiterated the fact that UPC had OBJECTED to this application at the meeting on the 22nd August 2018 and that this decision remains in place until and unless a new or modified application is submitted and put out for further consultation prior to any submission to the Eastern Area Planning Committee.

8. Items for Future Agenda

Statement received from DM regarding comments missing from Minutes of Meeting on 10th October 2018 (see FC meeting minutes of 12th December 2018 – Item 17c.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 7.50pm.

The scheduled date of the next Planning Meeting is **Wednesday 9th January 2019 at 7:00 pm** in Urchfont Village Hall.

For all planning enquiries, please contact Clerk to the Council, Bob Lunn by email at clerk@urchfont-pc.gov.uk or by telephone on 01380 848737.

APPENDIX TO PLANNING MINUTES OF 12th DECEMBER 2018

Meeting Between UPC Representatives and QDOS Homes 8th October 2018

Time and Date of Meeting	15:30 on Monday 8 th October 2018
Meeting requested by	Dave Mottram and Bill Donald
Consent from	
Application No.	18/06977/FUL
Applicant (or their agent)	Tuttle Architectural Services
Address / Location of (*proposed) site	Uphill
Councillors Present	Dave Mottram and Bill Donald
Details of other parties present	Steve Harbour and Paul Newman, QDOS Homes
Parties excluded and reason	None
Details of documents inspected	Plan view of the proposed development at Uphill
Listed/Conservation Area/AOMC/AONB /TPO	

Brief resume or bullet points of discussion (continue on reverse if needed):

UPC's response to WC following the meeting on 22nd August was to object on the following grounds:
UPC objects on the grounds that the UPC Planning Committee had insufficient information to enable support of it. UPC believe that more detailed reports needed 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 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.

Some of these had been answered, others needed more detail, and some views as to their feasibility. The agenda item for the 10th October meeting was for UPC to discuss and agree the contents of the presentation to be made by Urchfont Parish Council at the Eastern Area Planning Committee meeting, to be held on Thursday 1st November 2018. In order to better inform this discussion and update UPC's previous objections, we held meetings with members of the UWLNP steering group and on 8th October this meeting with Steve Harbour and Paul Newman of QDOS homes. The UPC Planning Policy specifies various stages of planning, and how meetings with developers are approved by UPC at these stages. The stage that this planning application was at on 8th October doesn't exactly fit any of these stages. We feel that this meeting was convened in accordance with UPC Planning Policy and Procedure 4.2 (a). However, due to what we consider to be extenuating circumstances we have not until now submitted a post meeting report.

During the meeting we discussed with the developers the feasibility of various options to reduce the visual impact of the development. QDOS had already met with WC planners to have similar discussions.

We also discussed ways of improving access to the site, and if a footpath could be built between Foxley Fields and the B3098 as part of this development. The outcome of our discussions was used to inform the options we presented at the UPC planning meeting on 10th October.

Time finished 16:30	
------------------------	--

Signature of Lead Councillor at Meeting: Dave Mottram