

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF URCHFONTS PARISH COUNCIL held on Wednesday 12 April 2017 at 7:00pm in the Conference Room of Urchfont Village Hall.**

**Present:** UPC Chair Dave Mottram (DM) Vice-Chair Bill Donald (BD) Lead of Planning Trevor Hill (TH) Cllrs: John Chapman (JC) Graham Day (GD) Nicky Mitchell (NM) Royston Thomas (RT) Andy Stephens (AS) & Planning Administrator Sandra Johnston (SJ)

**Also present:** Wiltshire Cllr Philip Whitehead (PW) – acting Clerk to the Full Council.

**Members of the public:** D Stevens, M & R Kemp, I Johnston, M Smith, R Hawkins, P & C Rotherham & Z Hayes. Also present Richard Harlow (Agent for 5b & 5c) and Paul Newman (Agent for 5d).

**1. Apologies for absence:** Bob Lunn - Parish Clerk.

**\*\*Cllr Mottram welcomed all present and invited Cllr Hill, Lead Cllr for Planning, to continue the business of the Planning Meeting.**

**2. Declarations of Interest:** 5c. Cllr Thomas: Pecuniary Interest as applicant (intended to leave the room during consideration of 5c). 5d. Cllr Mottram: Non-Pecuniary Interest. 5d. Cllr Stephens: Non-Pecuniary Interest (entitled to speak & vote but elected not to participate in either).

**3. Minutes of a meeting** held on 08 March 2017 were signed as a true record: proposed by Cllr Day, seconded by Cllr Thomas; agreed unanimously.

**4. Matters arising from those Minutes:** None

**Plans for discussion**

Council Members were reminded by **TH** 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.**

**5. Plans for discussion**

**5a) 17/01752/FUL** - Full Planning Application for a Single Storey side Extension at 'Hamilton', Peppercombe Close, Urchfont, Devizes SN10 4QS, for Mr Andrew Cook.

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

Site meeting held Saturday 25/03/17 - 3 Parish Cllrs (TH/JC/BD) & Mrs Cook present. Other Cllrs viewed independently.

The Planning Committee found as follows:

**TH** - Application site viewed by UPC Cllrs: noted that the footprint of the proposed single storey extension would be slightly larger than that of the uPVC conservatory it was to replace and also taller than existing.

**BD** - Felt this was rather a high single storey construction, as it appeared to take the apex of the roof to the top of the first floor of the house.

**TH** - Agreed it was taller than the original Conservatory and did not match the height of the garage roof on the other side of the house but would be far more energy efficient, which is the applicants desired outcome. There are 2 windows on the neighbouring property 'Sunnyside', which face the proposed extension, but both have frosted glass so the extension should cause no adverse impact.

**JC** - Agreed there was a slight imbalance to the front elevation of the house but did not have a problem with the new extension being taller, as it would be more aesthetically pleasing than the existing conservatory.

**RT** - Planning Officers will make an informed decision on the height of the proposal.

**17/01752/FUL** - Cllr: Hill proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application: Seconded by Cllr Donald; motion passed by 6 in favour & 1 abstention (Cllr had not managed to view the site).

**5e) 17/03426/TCA** – Works to Trees in a Conservation Area to consist of the Felling of 2 x Cypress

Trees; all at 'Hamilton', Peppercombe Close, Urchfont, Devizes SN10 4QS, for Mr Andrew Cook.

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

No site meeting required, as most Cllrs had viewed independently.

The Planning Committee found as follows:

**JC** – Had observed the trees and found them to be typical conifers; not of particular import, approx 15' and causing a high amount of shade to shrubs & plants below.

**17/03426/TCA** - Cllr: Hill proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application: Seconded by Cllr Thomas; motion passed by 6 in favour & 1 abstention (Cllr had not viewed the trees).

**5b) 17/02066/FUL** - Full Planning Application for a proposed Two Storey side Extension, front Porch & detached Carport/Garage with ancillary accommodation over. All at Laurel House, The Ham, Urchfont, Devizes, SN10 4SG, for Mr Arthur Hayes.

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

Site meeting held Wednesday 12/04/17 - 4 Parish Cllrs (TH/NM/RT/BD), Mrs Hayes & S. Johnston present. GD & JC viewed independently.

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

Statement by Zoi Hayes – Applicant.

Since we moved to Laurel House over 10 years ago, we have always believed that a plot of this size can support more than a 3 bedroom house.

The plot is .65 of an acre and can easily accommodate the reasonable requested extension and garage; we fully intend it should enhance the property and area. We would like to point out that the other two bungalows on the Ham have 4 bedrooms each so our 2 storey house can easily accommodate 5 bedrooms. With the help of our architect, we have thoughtfully designed the 2nd floor on the east side of the house with only one thin high window in the new bathroom to let in light. This is specifically intended to avoid overlooking neighbours. The drive side bedroom window will be a spare room so not constantly occupied. We tend to spend time at the back of the house garden side. We trust these constructive plans will be taken on board and you will support our application. Thank you.

Statement by Corrine Rotherham – 'Highfield' (Next door neighbour)

For privacy, we already have net curtains on the drive side windows and are now concerned that, if this proposal goes ahead, the extension bedroom windows on the front of Laurel House will be able to look into our two main bedroom windows, situated to the rear of our bungalow. At any time, the proposed extra bedrooms could be used for B&B purposes and be constantly in use. Being a bungalow next to a two storey house, we already have light issues and the proposed two storey house extension and two storey Garage will cause reduced light to our two main bedroom windows and may impact on our north facing bedroom wall, causing increased damp. In order to make room for the proposed garage, a large tree has been removed. We received light through and from under the tree's branches; not possible now if a two storey double garage is built in its place. We also have concerns over increased noise caused by a 'snug' room and a new side door being built close to our boundary. What is the acceptable minimum distance between properties and does this proposed extension meet these regulations? Thank you.

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

The Planning Committee found as follows:

**TH** – With regard to issues of possible overlooking, the proposed site for the extension and garage were viewed from all aspects. Cllrs also allowed access to view from the gardens of 'Highfield'.

**BD**- Found it hard to argue the issue of light loss, as UPC had viewed allowed builds where windows in adjacent properties were much closer. Was there a defined distance for possible overlooking from windows?

**TH** – From his research it would appear that WC decides what is acceptable on a case-by-case approach.

**DM** – Agreed but stated that one factor depended on the 45 degree sight line. Before making a final decision, the Planning Officer will take into account any possible overlooking from windows.

**TH** – The proposed front bedroom windows will be offset. Can understand the neighbours concerns but are there sufficient grounds for UPC planning committee to object to the application?

**NM** – Having viewed the site of the proposed build from all angles, the extension's first floor windows would not appear to be directly facing the ground floor bedroom windows of the neighbouring bungalow.

**BD** – Believed that WC should make decisions regarding possible overlooking.

**GD** - Could not attend the site visit but had viewed from the roadway. Agreed houses offset but had concerns for neighbours who were themselves concerned with possible overlooking and loss of light.

**TH** – Asked for a decision as to whether UPC opposed or supported this planning application?

**DM** - Support the application with a comment requesting WC look at the issue of light and privacy loss?

**GD** - Would not want to try to teach WC Planners their job. Opined that the Planning Officer would take a professional overview of all comments and if there were adverse implications with regards line of sight then necessary action would be taken.

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

Richard Harlow - Agent

Planners assess all aspects of a planning application, from all points of view. The Case Officer from WC has visited the site, viewed the plans and will make his/her final report. The report will be open for review.

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

**TH** – In his opinion, the neighbour's issues regarding loss of light and privacy were of concern but not of sufficient weight for him to advise the planning committee to object to the application on the table. He proposed that UPC support this planning application but make representation to the Planning Officer regarding loss of privacy, sight lines, etc.

**17/02066/FUL** Councillor Day proposed that Urchfont Parish Council **Support** this application but request that Wiltshire Council pay particular attention to the technical issues raised by neighbours to the North, regarding loss of privacy, light, sight lines and amenities: Seconded by Cllr Hill; motion passed by 6 votes in favour & 1 abstention (Cllr had not viewed the site).

**5c) 17/02067/FUL** - Full Planning Application for a proposed Single Storey side & rear Extension and proposed Satellite Dish, Shed and Greenhouse. All at 17 The Orchard, Urchfont, Devizes, SN10 4QX, for Mr Royston Thomas.

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

Site meeting held Wednesday 29/03/17 - 4 Parish Cllrs (TH/JC/NM/GD) + Mr & Mrs Thomas present. Other Cllrs viewed independently.

Cllr Thomas left the table but was invited by Cllr. Mottram to remain in the conference room.

**\*\*The Planning meeting then adjourned for public participation:-**

Statement by Richard Harlow – Agent.

The extension is a replacement structure, replacing the single storey garage. The extension will be slightly larger, projecting to the rear and across the back of the house and has been designed to minimize the effect to the neighbours by keeping to a flat roof design. This flat roof design replicates other similar extensions within the street scene of Orchard Close, as to not introduce an alien feature into the street. The application also seeks permission for a shed and greenhouse but these small ancillary buildings are, in all probability, most unlikely to require planning permission and could be erected under permitted development rights for the property.

**\*\*Cllr Hill closed Public participation and the planning meeting re-opened:**

The Planning Committee found as follows:

**TH** – The application speaks for itself. As mentioned, the shed, greenhouse & satellite dish would appear to fall under 'permitted development', therefore discussion should focus on the footprint, tree removal, alteration to vehicular access and any effect on neighbouring properties.

**DM** - Worth pointing out that the loss of the garage is not an issue and the proposed additions would improve the property. The extensions have a larger footprint but include that of the existing garage. A small fruit tree is to be removed but it is not a tree of significance.

**BD** - The tree is closer to 'The Lanterns'. (No objections have been made by neighbours).

**NM** - Opined it was a sympathetic refurbishment and would enhance the property, bringing it up to modern standards /amenities.

**JC** – Is a flat roof and should not be overly conspicuous from High Street, as the plot is slightly higher.  
**17/02067/FUL** - Cllr Hill proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application: Seconded by Cllr Day; motion passed unanimously.

**5d) 17/02258/FUL** - Full Planning Application for the Demolition of an existing dwelling and erection of Four Dwellings with Garages & associated works; all at 'The Beeches', Blackboard Lane, Urchfont, Devizes, SN10 4RD, for Qdos Homes Ltd.

\*To date, 7 letters of representation had been received by WC Planning Office and/or UPC.

No site visit had taken place as UCP had visited during 2 previous planning applications. Cllrs were invited to re-view independently (by request to Mr S Harbour), if they so wished.

\*\* Having declared a non-pecuniary conflict of interest in item 5d, Cllr Mottram, following guidelines issued by WC & UPC Clerk Bob Lunn, would take part in any discussion of this application but would not be voting. Cllr Mottram then ceded the Chair to Cllr Donald:-

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

Statement from Richard Hawkins – Resident.

The previous application for this site was subject to a WC Case Officer's report stating:

*"It is identified within the (2013) 'Parish Housing Needs Survey for the area that there is a need for smaller low-cost housing within the area (1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes) which should ideally be provided within the scheme. The limited developable area would also lend itself to a scheme comprising smaller units (perhaps modest bungalows towards the rear of the site) as opposed to larger plots in a cramped layout. This suggestion has been put forward to the applicant but has not been taken up"*.

\* Our Neighbourhood Plan has a vision that: '*Local people have access to a home they can afford*' and an objective of: '*Develop sufficient land for small scale market and affordable housing to meet local need*'. Policy H2 b states: '*show a predominance of 2 & 3 bedroom houses and/or include small scale housing units for older people*'.

\* This scheme does not satisfy these criteria. Plot 1 is a large 4 bedroom house which is not required in the Neighbourhood Plan. Plots 2 & 3 are smaller semi detached houses which are welcome, but they will have a rather imposing urban town house appearance in a prominent position at the corner of Manor Close and Blackboard Lane. The design is out of context with regard to the surrounding area. They might well be better positioned where the detached house is proposed.

Plot 4 is a bungalow which has a larger floor area than the detached house and is approximately double the size of the typical bungalow in the village. This is not what was envisaged as 'small scale housing units for older people' in our plan.

We surely all expect our Neighbourhood Plan to be a document to be used to provide the housing we need? It is clear in its aims to provide smaller, more affordable, homes for families and elderly people. If it is not going to be used for that purpose why have we spent 5 years producing it?

All developers will wish to maximise their profits but that must not be allowed to override the aims of the community.

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

The Planning Committee found as follows:

**SJ** – Informed Committee of 3 main areas of public concern, taken from the 7 letters of representation sent to WC (all supportive of the application). These were; a possible planning restriction on future dormers in the bungalow (Plot 4), soft planting carried out in front of Plots 2 & 3 and consideration for nesting birds during the extensive tree felling which will take place.

**TH** – Asked Mr Newman, Agent for Qdos Homes Ltd., if the pre-planning meeting with Planning Officer Jonathan James had taken place as suggested in Mr Harbour's previous letter? Mr Newman stated that the Officer would obviously not commit but had seemed happier that the new plans addressed reasons for refusal of previous Qdos planning applications.

**TH** - The application was virtually the same as one of the 3 presented at a public meeting, when UPC and neighbours of the 'Beeches' were present. Before finalisation of the current plan, near neighbours had been consulted by Mr Harbour and appeared to be satisfied that the majority of their previous concerns had been addressed. Our earlier opposition to this development was because it did not satisfy the policies of the NP. Policy H1 now seems to be satisfied, but does the new plan meet Policy H2 i.e. provide an overall

predominance of 2 & 3 bedroom houses?

**BD** – The UWL draft NP was used to convincingly reject the last 'Beeches' planning application. The NP is only a guide, it is not designed to be prescriptive.

**DM** - Of sites in the NP, 2 contain properties which will be demolished, therefore the land has an inflated price to start with; cannot really compare empty land to that with existing houses on.

**RT** – After a great deal of protest and many concerns from near neighbours of The Beeches, personally pleased to see there has been compromise and this current plan now appeared to be acceptable to them.

**JC** – This development plan for The Beeches is a great improvement on previous planning applications. It may not fit our Neighbourhood Plan exactly but is a much closer fit than those that were refused.

**TH** - This answers community concerns and goes some way towards Policy H2 but it still does not provide 2 bedroom houses.

**BD** – Should UPC ask WC for a covenant to be put in, regarding no future installation of dormer windows to Plot 4?

**GD** – This is a well judged application in content and timing, designed to circumvent the concerns of immediate neighbours but otherwise generally ignore the overall aspirations of the UWLNP. I would accept that the UWLNP is not immutable but feel that it should not be challenged (and breached) before it has been voted on by the public. There would seem to be a contradiction if UPC simultaneously encourages parishioners to support the N.Plan as drafted... and supports this application”.

**DM** - UPC has supported a planning application that had no 3 bedroom houses in it.

**TH** – That application was determined by what was stated in the Site Briefs but they no longer have weight as far as the NP Policies are concerned.

**RT** – This is expensive land to build on / **DM** – We should forget cost.

**GD** – He would remind Councillors that the question of land cost was dealt with in UPC January Planning meeting and minuted accordingly. [Minuted on 11 Jan 2017 GD... 'the price of land in Urchfont precluding the development of affordable houses is something of a red herring. A developer minded to develop affordable housing would surely ensure that the price paid to purchase the land was commensurate with this objective?']

**17/02258/FUL** - Cllr Thomas proposed that Urchfont Parish Council **Support** this application, **Subject to** the condition that no Dormer Windows be incorporated, now or in the future, in the East facing roof aspect of the Bungalow on Plot 4: Seconded by Cllr Chapman; motion passed by 3 votes in favour, 2 against & 2 abstentions through 'Interest'.

## **6. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council since 02 March 2017**

**6a) 17/00438/FUL** - Full Planning Application for Retrospective permission for the erection of a 1.8 mtr high, close-board Wooden Fence to the side elevation of 10 Manor Close, Urchfont, Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4RE, for Mr Colin & Mrs Janet Crowe. **Approve with Conditions**

**\*\*\*TH** – Had previously circulated an email to councillors expressing his dismay and how appalled he was that this application had been approved. He felt that by approving this high fence it set a very worrying precedent. He asked councillors what, if any action, they thought might be appropriate in response. Following discussion, it was agreed that there was little that could be done and that UPC must accept the planning officer's decision.

**6b) 17/00916/FUL** - Full Planning Application for Retrospective permission to Restore and Re-roof single storey existing Garden Shed/Store at 'The Old School', High Street, Urchfont, Wilts., SN10 4QH for Mr & Mrs Leigh. **Approve with Conditions**

**6c) 17/01030/TPO** – Works to TPO trees to consist of; Silver Birch (T1) - crown clean, and crown raise to give 1m clearance from top of hedge. Red Oak (T3) - crown clean, reduce crown and crown raise to 4m over neighbouring property to balance. Wild Cherry (T4) - crown clean, thin crown and remove stubs from previous work. Red Oak (T11) - crown clean and crown raise to 4m to give clearance over lawn and hedge. Common Oak (T10) - lift and reduce limbs on neighbours side to balance. Beech 'Asplenifolia' (T8) - crown clean. Crown raise to 4m to give clearance over lawn. Smooth Japanese Maple (T7) - minor crown lifting and balancing to give 4m clearance over lawn. Turkey Oak (T6) - crown raise to 6m (as per notification of Full Planning Permission E/2013/0246/FUL). Reduce crown by 25%: All at Jubilee House, Townsend, Urchfont, Devizes, Wilts., SN10 4RR, for Mr A Stephens. **Approve with Conditions**

**6d) 17/01150/TPO** – Works to TPO trees to consist of; 1 x Grey Poplar tree (T1)- Fell; at 'Moonacre', High Street (B3098), Urchfont, Devizes, Wiltshire SN10 4RP, for Mr R Kemp. **Approve with Conditions**

**6e) 17/01292/TCA** – Works to tree in a Conservation Area to consist of; 1 x Cherry tree (T2) – Fell; at 'Moonacre', High Street (B3098), Urchfont, Devizes, Wiltshire SN10 4RP, for Mr R Kemp. **No Objection**

**6f) 17/01259/FUL** Full Planning Application for Extension to existing hay Storage Barn at Marsh Lane Barns, Marsh Lane, Urchfont, Devizes SN10 3PR, for J M Bodman Ltd ( c/o Martin Bodman, Knights Leaze Farm, Urchfont, Wilts., SN10 4RA. **Approve with Conditions**

## **7. Matters for Report**

### Pond Wall

**DM** Karen Guest had kept UPC well informed. All seems to be going well.

**BD** Thought it certainly looks like a major piece of work.

**NM** Had been informed by the agent that the job was almost at an end. They hoped to complete Pond side by the end of the week and have scaffolding down the following week (wk commencing 17/04); pointing carried out on Manor Farmyard side the same week. Hopefully all will be finished by Scarecrow weekend.

**RT** Had spoken with Redcliffe to request that they might install some form of permanent fixings that would accommodate the hanging of the Christmas lights along Pond Wall.

**GD** Opined there had been a curious mix of materials used and a lot of conspicuous construction going on. There had been a lot of 'window dressing' carried out by a lot of operatives but he still had concerns as no-one knew what the wall had been re-built on top of?

**TH** They could have just made good. By taking the wall down to where they have done and re-building it, they have done as good a job as can be expected.

**JC** The wall has not yet been conveyed to the ownership of the Manor Farmyard Management Company and he has concerns that the residents will do what is in their power to resist the transfer, either singly or together. The appearance of the re-built wall is positive but, not being an engineer and having no idea what is below ground, he does have reservations as to its future.

There being no other business, the Planning Meeting closed at 8:15 pm.

The proposed date of the next Planning Meeting is **Wednesday 10 May 2017 at 7:00 pm** in Urchfont Village Hall: preceding the Full Council meeting.

Planning Administrator Sandra Johnston – 01380 848774 – 07808 124721 – [sandra-j@virgin.net](mailto: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](http://www.urchfont-pc.gov.uk) or go to [www.wiltshire.gov.uk](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk) and click on 'Planning Applications' – 'Planning applications online' - 'Search by planning application number'.

Signed .....

Date .....