

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF URCHFONTS PARISH COUNCIL held on Wednesday 09 August 2017 at 7:00 pm in the Conference Room of Urchfont Village Hall.

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 N Lemon (applicant 5b) Mr R Ellis (applicant 5c) S Billyard, R Gillington, D & P Guiney, C Harrison, S & A Hodges, S Holt, L Jennings, M Wingent.

Cllr: Mottram welcomed all present, including new UPC Cllr Maria Kemp. He then handed over to Cllr Hill, as Lead Councilor for Planning, to continue the business of the meeting.

1. Apologies for absence: Cllr: Lewis Cowen.

2. Declarations of Interest: None

3. Minutes of a meeting held on 12 July 2017 were signed as a true record: proposed by Cllr Day, seconded by Cllr Hawkins; 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 informed the Committee and public of his intention to take each application out of sequence, according to the interest it had generated and the number of people in attendance who wished to speak.

5. Plans for discussion

5d) 17/06599/TCA – Works to trees in a Conservation Area to consist of the Felling of 1 no. Chestnut Tree; situated behind the wall at The Pond, High Street, Urchfont, SN10 4BA; for Redcliffe Homes Ltd.

*To date, 1 letter of representation had been received by WC Planning Office and/or UPC.

Site meeting held on Wednesday 09/08/17 - 8 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/GC/GD/BD/RH/MK/NM/), & S Johnston being present.

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

Statement by Celia Harrison – Urchfont resident

Since the redevelopment began on Manor Farm Yard, Urchfont has lost a Cherry, a Rowan and other trees from behind the Pond wall. The remaining tree, a Horse Chestnut, is not overly large and helps to soften the impact and stark view of the new buildings that now stand on the far side of Pond wall.

Statement by Sarah Billyard – Urchfont resident

A Horse Chestnut is an appropriate tree to find growing in a village, by a pond, and should not be felled. Despite the developers initial assurances that some of the existing trees would remain behind Pond wall, a year after their departure, we find ourselves on the verge of having none. May I request that any re-planting along the wall should consist of evergreens such as Holly and Yew.

Statement read by Stephen Hodges – resident of Manor Farm Yard.

"I reiterate and support the views of those who have already spoken, regarding the tree, and object to its

falling. It is an important screen, indeed the only remaining screening, to what is now a large expanse of red bricked and red tiled housing behind the pond. Removing the trees from behind the pond has materially altered the view and aesthetics of the Conservation Area. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Treecall, which was part of the original planning documentation, identified this tree (T4) as one which should remain as part of the screening, which includes planting of new trees, and I see no evidence as to why this should change.

I have concerns regarding the application made by Redcliffe Homes. It states '*Needs to be felled as it's pushing against the pond wall...*' Firstly, there is no evidence in terms of reports or statements that the tree is pushing against the wall. Secondly, photographs taken of the works show that no excavations were made that could enable assessment of whether or not roots were pushing, or likely to push, against the wall. In my opinion, it is a phrase plucked out from the air by Redcliffe and not based on evidence. The application also states '*Replacing in same place will cause same problems*'. This concerns me as it implies the developer is not going to fulfil its duties and plant new screening as detailed in the Landscape Plan, which formed part of the original planning consent. However, I do agree with the statement '*...and has been recommended to be felled by structural engineer*'. The report by Craddys states '*Remove existing tree stumps and their root balls, taking care not to damage the wall.*' And '*Remove historic trees that still remain and their root ball, taking care not to damage the wall.*' However, it specifies these works being completed prior to the repairs to the wall! None of which have been done: surely doing these works now will result in damage to the cosmetically repaired wall, which will then require further repair work.

My final point concerns the recommendations in the Impact Assessment by Treecall Consulting for instances where trees that are to remain are in close proximity to walls and buildings. In this, recommendations are made to mitigate conflict between tree growth and construction. These include managing root development through root cutting, and where roots are of a certain size, to adopt specific construction approaches. My concern is that none of these recommended approaches have been adopted in the repair works to the wall, and photographic evidence suggests that no attempt at assessing how these recommended approaches could be used has been made.

I reiterate my objection to the removal of the tree because of the detrimental effect to the aesthetics of the Conservation Area and there being no evidence to support this application. I propose that other approaches to felling should be considered and assessed". Thank you.

Statement by Simon Holt – Urchfont resident

The Chestnut tree had caused the pond wall to bow out once before as it grew. The wall is now upright but the tree will cause the wall to bow out again as the tree grows. It should therefore be felled as it is the right tree but in the wrong place.

Statement by Rodney Gillington – resident of Manor Farm Yard.

RG supports this application in the belief that, if the Chestnut is left to grow larger, the roots will cause future damage to the recently repaired pond wall. It is Redcliffe Homes intention to re-plant behind the wall with shrubs. The removal of the tree should proceed as proposed.

Statement read by Martin Wingent – Urchfont resident.

"I am disappointed to learn that Redcliffe would like to fell this tree. I fully appreciate that, in time, the roots could cause a problem given its close proximity to the pond wall. However, this tree (T4) was not in the "recommended to be felled list" by the Tree Call Consulting Ltd (Section 6) report of Nov 2012 so I cannot see where Redcliffe claims it was. I could see no specific felling recommendation of T4 in the Craddy's report of March 2016 either. This tree is classed as an early mature tree and its removal would make the whole stretch behind the pond wall look quite bare. Would it not be a good idea to wait a couple of years to give the chance of other landscaping shrubs to grow up enough to break up the sight of the long line of the wall? If it is an urgent problem, why didn't Redcliffe propose the felling of the tree before repairing the wall? I am, of course, assuming that Redcliffe will finish off the landscaping". Thank you.

2nd Statement by Sarah Billyard

A full length re-planting of shrubs behind the pond wall will not provide a screening of Manor Farm Yard buildings. When Redcliffe Homes put in their initial planning applications to WC, they came to speak to Urchfont community in a public meeting at the village hall. They assured us that there would be screening, at the back of the wall, of the new residential development and this would preserve the street scene, which

obviously soft and low plantings will not. Those assurances given have not been kept.

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

The Planning Committee found as follows:

DM- Would be inclined to support the application but agreed with Martin Wingent that the felling could wait until sufficient growth of new plantings. Disappointed the suggested plantings will be only be shrubs.

MK- The engineer states the tree is pushing against the wall but won't its removal also affect the wall?

NM- Feels it is a great shame to lose the one remaining tree that softens the street scene of the village pond. Cannot the root growth be controlled by judicious pruning now and future maintenance of the tree? Surely when the roots die and leave cavities in the lower parts of the wall, this will cause more damage than leaving well alone for a few years.

BD- As UPC knows from experience, experts make the final decision in all tree applications. We can't argue the Horse Chestnut's case from a technical point of view, only an aesthetic view. General public opinion is against the felling, therefore UPC Planning Committee should return an Objection to the application.

MK- Questioned the ownership of the tree?

*It was explained that, until Redcliffe could transfer ownership of the Manor Farm Yard environs to a Manor Fyd Management Company, Redcliffe Homes was still responsible for the land behind the wall.

RH- Ownership of the wall had always been in dispute but Redcliffe took responsibility for repairing it.

GD- When the WC arboriculturalist recently visited to study and list trees in Urchfont for possible TPO's, do we know if he looked at this tree? **DM** believed not.

RH- Not happy at planned removal of the root ball. From his experience as a Chartered Civil Engineer he was of the opinion that roots dying and shrinking in and near the foot of Pond wall could cause future instability.

RT- It appeared to him that the tree in question was coming out whatever the arguments for or against. The Conservation Officer wished to keep as much generic planting as possible on M.Fmyd. Understandable the Hawthorns were removed as their roots seek water and would cause damage to the wall. Any shallow rooted trees and shrubs would be appropriate to plant behind Pond wall.

TH- Asked for any strong views against felling the Chestnut tree, as a final decision was now needed.

TH was personally unhappy at the prospect of a bland, suburban, landscape behind the Pond, where there was once all manner of vegetation. He would wish for the tree to be in situ for longer as, once removed, the Pond scene and its landscape would be permanently ruined.

MK- She had studied the application at length and could find little strong evidence for the tree's removal.

17/06599/TCA - Cllr: Donald proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Object to** this application on aesthetic grounds, unless the tree expert at WC can ascertain whether there would be any long term detrimental effects on the structural stability of the wall should it remain: Seconded by Cllr Hawkins; motion passed unanimously.

DM- Requested that Cllr Thomas write to David Wyatt, representing Urchfont P.C's views on this matter, to discuss possible planting schemes and ask who would be responsible for the re-planting.

Action RT

Rodney Gillington requested of the Chairman that UPC might influence a planting scheme that was of as high a standard as was possible.

5b) 17/06271/FUL & 17/06754/LBC (Listed Building Consent) - Full Planning Application for a single storey Kitchen Extension /parapet flat roof structure with lantern; A first floor Extension to form Bathroom /pitched roof structure above flat roof projection; Re-slating existing Roof (maintenance & repair works): all at The Forge, High Street, Urchfont, SN10 4QH, for Mr Nick Lemon.

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

Site meeting held on Thursday 03/08/17 - 8 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/GC/BD/RH/MK/NM/RT) and Mr & Mrs Lemon being present.

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

Statement given by Nick Lemon – Applicant

He and his wife fell in love with the house but recognised that 1) it did not have the living space required for a modern family and 2) felt that the house had been somewhat unloved over the years. In particular,

additions in the 1970/80's had adversely affected the rear aspect of the house. Since moving in they have worked with the listed building, putting a lot of thought into what should be done. Their wish is not to touch the original elements of the house but to remove/improve the latter additions, only proposing doing what they feel is necessary. A small kitchen extension and single story flat roof so as not to impose on neighbours and a second floor extension on the far side (also not impacting on neighbours), built over an existing, ugly, flat roof. They wish to replace the building's current roof with a slate roof. Mr & Mrs Lemon wish to be respectful of the location and the beauty of the original house and make it their forever home.
**Public participation was closed and the planning meeting re-opened:

The Planning Committee found as follows:

TH- Cllrs who attended the site visit had concluded that a lot of planning advice had been sought to achieve the correct results for this listed building.

Cllrs agreed that the designs were well thought out and once achieved, would make a great improvement to the rear of the dwelling.

DM- Believed that all works carried out to date by the applicants was of a high standard; sympathetic to the building and UPC should support their application on that evidence.

17/06271/FUL & 17/06754/LBC - Cllr: Donald proposed that UPC Planning Committee Support this application in view of the extensive and sympathetic refurbishments that have already been carried out by the applicant: Seconded by Cllr Hawkins; motion passed unanimously

5c) 17/06436/VAR – Removal of Condition 7 of planning permission K/35652/O to enable the use of the vehicular access opposite Uphill Farm in association with the dwelling house known as Uphill House, Uphill, Urchfont, SN10 4SB, for Mr Roy Ellis.

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

Site meeting held on Wednesday 09/08/17 - 8 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/GC/GD/BD/RH/MK/NM/), Roy Ellis, R Cosker (agent) & S Johnston being present.

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

Mr Ellis was asked if he wished to make a statement but was content that all Q & A's had been covered during the site meeting.

Simon Holt asked if the original conditions on K/35652/O were available? **SJ** replied not; as no actual plans or documents for Kennet could be accessed on the relevant WC planning page.

That application was refused due to historic traffic movement of farm vehicles.

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

The Planning Committee found as follows:

BD- Urchfont PC should support the lifting of the original conditions. Should one of the properties on this site be sold to a non family member, there could very well be problems between the new and existing owners regarding the shared access driveway.

DM- Opined that it was common sense for this redundant entrance and driveway to now be opened and it should have happened years ago. The amenities of each dwelling on the plot should be considered in the light of future separate ownerships.

17/06436/VAR - Cllr: Day proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application: Seconded by Cllr Mitchell; motion passed unanimously.

5a) 17/06324/FUL - Full Planning Application for erection of an Agricultural Building and retention of area of hard-standing, parking area & surfacing works to existing access - on land at Crookwood Wood, Potterne Wick, Devizes, SN10 5QS, for Mr Mark Whelehan.

*To date, 1 letter of representation had been received by WC Planning Office and/or UPC.

Site meeting held on Wednesday 09/08/17 - 8 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/GC/GD/BD/RH/MK/NM/), Mr Whelehan, R Cosker (agent) & S Johnston being present.

The Planning Committee found as follows:

TH- Explained that this application was, in part, retrospective.

GD- Questioned whether representational letters from individuals not residing in the Parish should be read out? **TH & SJ** answered in the affirmative and the letter was subsequently read by TH.

DM- Opined that this letter of objection was based on much conjecture and little fact.

TH- The flooding assessment report stated danger from flooding would not be expected and have little impact. Neighbouring landowners – Straker / Giddings / Harris – all appear to support the enterprise. The retrospective part of the application is for the erection of a sizeable timber shed (already in situ). Mr Whelehan also wishes to remove part of the front wall of this building to create a covered and contained area which could facilitate treatment of the sheep and lambing.

PW – Pointed out that that part of the application is for change to an existing building that has not been granted planning permission.

BD- The building in question is of very sound construction and not unsightly. It will weather down over time and, being well tucked away up a track and between trees, should not be noticeable.

GD- It would appear that UPC is being asked for their opinion on a retrospective erection?

DM- The application is only partly retrospective.

DS- Would our support set a precedent for this to happen again?

17/06324/FUL - Cllr: Hawkins proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application: Seconded by Cllr Donald; motion passed unanimously.

5f) 17/06144/FUL – Construction of a new Grain Store & associated works on Land to the South of Manor Farm, Wedhampton, Devizes SN10 3RR, for The Hon Mrs ASSF Morrison.

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

Site meeting held on Wednesday 09/08/17 - 8 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/GC/GD/BD/RH/MK/NM/), Mrs Morrison, R. Yeomans (RCC Town Planning), the Farm secretary & S Johnston being present.

5g) 17/06145/FUL - Construction of a new Grain Store & associated works on Land to the South of Manor Farm, Wedhampton, Devizes SN10 3RR, for The Hon Mrs ASSF Morrison.

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

Site meeting held on Wednesday 09/08/17 - 8 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/GC/GD/BD/RH/MK/NM/), Mrs Morrison, R. Yeomans (RCC Town Planning), the Farm secretary & S Johnston being present.

Cllr Mottram stated that the proposal to divert Footpath 21 Urchfont (part) at Wedhampton would not be discussed separately but in conjunction with applications 5f & 5g. (as above)

The Planning Committee found as follows:

TH- Although appearing at first sight to be the same, these 2 applications are different in that one application sites the proposed grain store further forward than the other, which would result in part of it being erected across a Public Right of Way (PROW). TH had studied a WC map showing the Conservation areas in Wedhampton, and Manor Farm's yard was not in that area. The map also showed that the line of the PROW was not as depicted on the map presented with the planning applications. It had subsequently been established that the Wiltshire Council map was the definitive and correct.

DM- At present the PROW goes through a working farmyard; not a good idea when considering public health and safety issues. The reason there are 2 similar applications for a new grain store (as above) is for the following set of logic to be applied. Mrs Morrison's preferred location for the grain store does not obstruct the current PROW through the working farmyard, but for safety reasons she would like the PROW re-routed. This process takes a long time. Her second application is for a location for the grain store which would obstruct the PROW. If this application is approved the process for re-routing the PROW is much quicker. If both applications are approved, Mrs Morrison can try to get the PROW moved because it is obstructed, but then build the store in her preferred location and the PROW has subsequently been moved from the working farmyard.

BD- I would ask that no grain drying be allowed if UPC support the building of a new grain store at Manor Farm.

TH- Was of the opinion that UPC should support both application 5f & 5g and also support in principle the re-routing of the PROW to divert it away from a working farmyard.

PW – Agreed to respond to the Rights of Way team that UPC is in favour of Footpath 21 Urchfont being moved from The Manor Farm farmyard at Wedhampton.

**The Planning meeting was adjourned for public participation:-
Statement from Linda Jennings – Urchfont resident.

Application 06144/FUL shows the proposed store closer to the existing barn than in 06145/FUL. This means that there is more of a cluster of farm buildings together, rather than their being further spread into the countryside. In addition, there is no hard standing or store in 06144, whereas there is in 06145. Application 17/06144/FUL is preferable because unnecessary land-take for buildings and hard surfaces should be discouraged. It is also preferable as the application shows a wider area of planting to the south and east than in application 06145/FUL. More planting means more screening and is beneficial for local nature and the environment.

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

DM- The applicant prefers application 06145: less preferred by her but speedier through the planning process would be application 06144... which does not have hard standing.

GD- Would personally support application 06144/FUL, with less space between the barns and less impact on the established planting. The re-routing of the PROW would also be an advantage.

17/06144/FUL - Cllr: Day proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application: Seconded by Cllr Donald; motion passed unanimously.

5g) 17/06145/FUL - Cllr: Day proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Object to** this application on the grounds that it has more of a negative environmental impact on the area than does application 06144/FUL. Seconded by Cllr Donald; motion passed unanimously.

5e) 17/06135/FUL - Change of Use of existing brick Agricultural Building (former brick Parlour building) and Conversion to form a single 2 Bedroom Dwelling / to include Demolition of attached modern portal Frame Building: all at Manor Farm, Wedhampton, Devizes SN10 3RR, for The Hon Mrs ASSF Morrison.

*To date, 1 letter of representation had been received by WC Planning Office and/or UPC.

Site meeting held on Wednesday 09/08/17 - 8 Parish Cllrs (TH/DM/GC/GD/BD/RH/MK/NM/), Mrs Morrison, R. Yeomans (RCC Town Planning), the Farm secretary & S Johnston being present.

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

Statement by Simon Holt – Urchfont resident

This is the first application for a new dwelling since the UWLNP was made. Development in Wedhampton isn't supported by the National Planning Policy Framework as Wedhampton cannot provide sustainable development. Wedhampton is listed by the Core Strategy as open space and no sites were supported in the UWL Neighbourhood Plan.

Statement from Linda Jennings – Urchfont resident.

The most relevant part of Wiltshire Core Policy 48 to this dwelling application is the third section, which deals with the "Conversion and re-use of redundant rural buildings". The last point of this section states *"where there is clear evidence that employment or tourism uses cannot be made viable, residential development may be appropriate where it meets the criteria i to v"*. I have not seen the **"clear evidence"** that the alternative uses are not viable, ie where are the details of how the property has been marketed for tourism or employment and for how long. In addition, it might be argued that the proposed dwelling does not satisfy criteria iv *"reasonable access to local services"* (lack of bus stops and no "easy" walking distances to facilities).

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

BD - I have a number of concerns regarding this application along with some inaccuracies to point out:

The Proposed Site Plan shows an access to the top of the High Street and the junction of the A342. This track used to be the entrance to the farm but was closed when the new entrance was opened to the east on the A342. I understand that there are no plans to re-open this track so it should not have been included in the newly created schematic plans.

*There are inaccuracies in the Planning Statement as follows;

- a. Section 3.2: The National Planning Policy focuses on the need for sustainable development and the avoidance of isolated housing in the countryside. Wedhampton has no facilities within walking distance. The applicant quotes a distance of 0.8 miles as the distance to the Old Potato Yard complex which has the nearest retail and service facilities. This is not an "easy" walking distance and Urchfont facilities are

over 1 mile away. Therefore it is likely that the occupants of the conversion would be using a car to access facilities; the proposal does not score highly on sustainability.

- b. Section 3.2 and figure 2: The Planning Statement suggests that there are regular bus services, along with adjacent bus stops. While Google Maps may still show a bus stop the author should look more closely as the bus stops were removed many years ago.
- c. Section 3.4: The building is in full view of the public footpath and not as stated "limited to glimpsed views".
- d. Section 5.4: It should be noted that The Neighbourhood Plan was actually "made" in June 2017.

***Impact in relation to the Urchfont Wedhampton and Lydeaway Neighbourhood Plan:**

- e. The Plan is very clear that development will be restricted solely to Urchfont. While this is a conversion of an existing building it is a development of a new dwelling.
- f. The UWLNP Policy H1 lists the only sites to be developed until 2026. However, the NP Steering Group had tried to include a change control capability within the plan. It was dismissed by WC & the examiner.
- g. The UWLNP set an objective to '*Protect and enhance the open countryside*'. The WC Strategy has not listed Wedhampton in its hierarchy of settlements. Accordingly, it can be regarded as open countryside. Therefore Wedhampton must be protected and not developed with new dwellings.

***Impact in relation to the WC Core Strategy:**

- h. It should be argued that this development is an isolated new home and goes against the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The proposal is on the periphery of Wedhampton in an area of sporadic buildings, mainly agricultural. There are no houses immediately adjacent.
- i. The Wiltshire Core Strategy has designated Wedhampton as 'open space' so it is unsuitable for development.
- j. Wiltshire Council's Core Policy 48 is important. The first section of this policy supports residential development only where it meets the accommodation needs of local agriculture or forestry workers or those engaged in employment essential to the countryside.
- k. If this dwelling was to be approved it might set a precedent for development in this general area in the future. It might also give developers encouragement to come forward with applications elsewhere in the Parish.

His conclusion was that the building was superfluous to family needs. It was historical, in good condition and lay within the cartilage of Manor Farm. If developed as a family dwelling, he would hope for an agricultural tie to be placed upon it. BD was disappointed that Mrs Morrison had not come forward when the Neighbourhood Plan was in its early stages.

DM- The building would be redundant if the proposed grain store were erected. It has 8" walls with no cavity, and is in very good condition. He agreed with Linda Jennings' point that relevant developers have dismissed any other use. Sustainability would cover it being converted into a house: a case of right building; wrong place. If in Urchfont it would not contravene the UWLNP. The NP is confusing as it talks about development but does not distinguish between new builds and conversions, being hard to define. There is a danger here of a very viable building being condemned. Answering a question as to the outcome of this application setting a precedent, DM opined that no rooflines or footprint would be altered.

GD- This is a fine building and it would be a very bad move not to utilize it. I would support an agricultural tie as this supports WC Core Strategies. **RT-** and the house could not be sold on in the future.

BD- Admitted that viewing the site and the building had changed his mind.

GC- The Farm Secretary had said that the proposed house was not intended to be an agricultural dwelling. There was then general debate between Councillors regarding precedent and **TH** opined that going down that route would preclude any in-fills taking place in the Parish. **DM** stated that this proposal would not change the landscape and there would be few similar buildings in the Parish to be converted. What policies in the UWLNP would it contravene if permitted? The existing building was a milking parlour: the applicant is asking for change of use of existing, not for developing.

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

Simon Holt was concerned that developers would jump in if the Neighbourhood Plan was mentioned in the UPC considerations returned to WC. He also quoted NP Policy H1 as stating that 'Managed housing growth in the Parish will be achieved through proposals involving approximately 37 houses in Urchfont which will be permitted on the following allocated sites'... tantamount to asking WC to ignore where new dwellings were to be built.

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

DM- read out UWLNP Policy H1, as follows;

Policy H1 states:

Policy H1 Housing site allocations

Managed housing growth in the Parish will be achieved through proposals involving approximately 37 houses in Urchfont which will be permitted on the following allocated sites.

- a) land at Hales Farm (approximately 12 dwellings)
- b) the Beeches, Blackboard Lane (approximately 5 dwellings)
- c) land opposite The Baishe (approximately 1 dwelling)
- d) land opposite Sawmills (approximately 1 dwelling)
- e) garden at Cuckoo Corner (approximately 1 dwelling)
- f) land at Alcudia, The Ham (approximately 1 dwelling)
- g) Peppercombe (approximately 4 dwellings)
- h) land at Wildman's Garage (approximately 5 dwellings)
- i) land at Uphill (approximately 7 dwellings)

PW- A Parish would never be expected to identify in its Neighbourhood Plan *all* dwelling places for the future. Windfalls will happen. 10 years ago Urchfont would not have identified The Beeches as an opportunity for a development area in its Parish. The NP will set strategies and plans but should accept that Windfalls will happen. If a property had 1 house on it but still had in place historical planning permission to demolish that house and build 2 on the site, then the other would be classed as a windfall.

TH- Policy H1 of the NP states that "*37 houses will be permitted*". It does not say 'will not'. It leaves out any that may crop up in the future. The NP has no specification on development in Wedhampton.

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

Simon Holt – With regard to possible windfall sites coming forward; at the earliest stage of the N. Plan, the NP Steering Group had walked the whole village of Urchfont and felt they had identified every space that could have been developed - but this was not written in chapter and verse in the final version of the Plan.

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

TH asked for a proposal:

17/06135/FUL - Cllr: Day proposed that UPC Planning Committee **Support** this application and express the desire to have an agricultural tie applied to the consent, that the building might then contribute to the agricultural activity in our Parish: Seconded by Cllr Hill; motion passed by 5 in favour & with 4 abstentions.

6. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council since 07 July 2017

6a) 17/04213/FUL & 17/04750/LBC – Full Planning Application for a proposed Replacement Single Storey Extension at Spring Cottage, 26 Green gate Road, Wedhampton, SN10 3QB, for Mr & Mrs J Ford.

Approve with Conditions

6b) 17/05156/FUL - Full Planning Application for a proposed Cabin at end of garden and a Shed adjacent to house; all at The Grange, High St., Urchfont, Devizes, SN10 4QL for Mr Dave Snowden.

Approve with Conditions

6c) 17/05683/TPO - Works to TPO Trees in a Conservation Area to consist of the Felling of 1 no. Scots Pine at 11 The Orchard, Urchfont, SN10 4QX, for Mr David Myers.

Refuse

7. Matters for Report

To discuss the impact of the WC Planning Dept. changes to the way planning application information is now be delivered to Town & Parish Councils and the possible effect on the UPC Planning Policy and Procedures.

There were 3 issues discussed:

1) The lack of availability of large scale plans often made it difficult to determine dimensions.

Action RH: To contact Wiltshire Council planning department to ask if they can request plans to be submitted with more dimensions shown, which are not affected by viewing the plans at different scales.

2) Large scale printed plans have often proved very useful at site meetings. A tablet computer would be a useful asset for the Planning Administrator to use at site meetings instead of the hard copy.

Action BL: To make enquiries about the cost of the tablet and for UPC to discuss the purchase at its September meeting.

3) Our Planning Policy and Procedures currently state that hard copy of plans can be viewed, by members of the public, by contacting the Planning Administrator. This will need updating as a result of the WC proposed changes.

There being no other business, the Planning Meeting closed at 9:05 pm.

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

Planning Administrator Sandra Johnston – 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' – 'hit application number.'

Signed Date