



DRAFT Minutes of the Urchfont Parish Council (UPC) Planning Meeting held remotely on Wednesday 10th March 2021

Present: Councillors: Day (GD – Chairman), Botham (MB – Vice Chairman), Hill (TH), Kemp (MK), Cowen (LC), Creasey (GC), Hollyman (MH) and Stevens (DS)

Clerk to the Council: Lunn (BL)

Councilor for Urchfont & The Cannings: Whitehead (PW)

Members of the Public (for all or part of the remote meeting): Mr. S Veitch, Mr. B Naylor, Mr. D Kinnaird

1. **Apologies:** Cllrs Cottle (SC) and Rotherham (PR)
2. **Declarations of Interest** – None declared at the meeting
3. **Minutes of a meeting held on 10th February 2021** – GD questioned whether the wording of the resolution under Item 7a is misleading in that UPC as a whole would not have the opportunity to consider the comments from Mr. Mottram et al before the consultation deadline. BL was of the view that the use of UPC as an entity from which the consultation response would be sent is correct, noting that the UPC had delegated TH to consider and action any public comments as appropriate on behalf of the whole Council. TH confirmed that he is happy with the wording of this resolution in the minutes.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	
To approve and sign the minutes unchanged as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	MH	MB	AGREED with one abstention due to not being at that meeting

4. **Matters arising from Minutes of 10th February 2021** – TH stated that an email received from M. Mottram will be discussed under Item 7a below.

5. Plans for discussion

It should be noted that no formal site visits took place for any of the applications being considered due to the COVID Lockdown, but individual councillors may have viewed proposals from outside properties where appropriate.

5a. 21/01195/VAR - Variation of condition 2 of E/11/0123/FUL to allow the building to be let separately from the main house but it shall not be sold separately or become a separate curtilage at Green Farm, The Green, Urchfont, SN10 4RB for Mr. & Mrs Corke.

Letters of representation – none received by UPC or published on the WC website

TH commented that this application relates to the stable block in front of and to the side of the main residence which has an earlier planning condition stating that it is to be used for short term holiday accommodation. The current application seeks to remove this condition to facilitate longer term lettings, some of which have already been undertaken. TH supported the application, GD stated that he could see no problems with the application.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	
To SUPPORT this application	TH	DS	AGREED unanimously

5b. 21/01084/TCA - T1 - Pittosporum tenuifolium (Kohuhu) - reduce by 40% at Church Farm House, Peppercombe Lane, Urchfont, SN10 4QR for Mr. Pendry

Letters of representation – none received by UPC or published on the WC website

No comments were made by councillors.

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	
NO OBJECTION to this application	TH	GC	AGREED unanimously

5c. 21/01583/FUL – Rear Oak Framed extension and carport at Spring Cottage, 1 The Bottom, Urchfont, SN10 4SF for Mrs Sherry

Letters of Representation – UPC had received three emails from Mr. D Mottram, Mr. M Taylor and Mrs A Taylor, none are published on the WC website to date. The emails had been copied to all councillors prior to the meeting.

TH commented that the representations related only to the car port element of this application and, in one case, the fact that neighbours had not been notified by WC of the application and that no green notice had been displayed at the time of sending the email. MH had reviewed the plans and had visited the site with MB (socially distanced). MH was of the view that access to the proposed carport was potentially dangerous in this already hazardous location, especially if it is intended to park two cars in the car port. MB agreed with the comments made by MH and considered the comments made in the letters of representation to be fair and reasonable. MK agreed with all the comments made and highlighted the rapidly vanishing grass triangle at the junction as evidence of likely highways issues. GD had visited the site and concurs with all the points made by fellow councillors. No comments were made about the proposed oak framed extension.

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	
Whilst UPC have no objections to the Oak Framed extension, the Council strongly OBJECT to the proposed car port on access and highway safety grounds in a narrow roadway / junction which is well used.	TH	MB	AGREED unanimously

6. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council up to 5th March 2021

6a. 21/00662/TCA – Fell - Aspen at Breach House, Cuckoo Corner, Urchfont, Devizes, Wiltshire, SN10 4RA – NO OBJECTION

6b. 21/00666/TCA - Mulberry Tree 0 Reduce by 10 - 15% to previous cuts, Cotoneaster – Fell at Mulberry House, High Street, Urchfont, Devizes, Wiltshire, SN10 4QP – NO OBJECTION

6c. 21/00644/TCA - Sycamore (T1) – multi-stemmed tree on bank. Fell due to excessive shading to 17 Manor Farmyard and Bluebell cottage at 17 Manor Farmyard, Urchfont, SN10 4BA – NO OBJECTION

6d. 20/11558/FUL - Proposed demolition & reconstruction of side extension to form ground floor dining area & enlarged 1st floor bedroom, conversion of garage to play room & extending side wall to form larger 1st floor bedroom & new study to rear of property, plus proposed garden workroom at 5 Manor Close, Urchfont, SN10 4RE – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

6e. 20/11533/FUL- Part retrospective application for the creation a new agricultural track at Manor Farm, Conock, SN10 3QQ – APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

6f. 21/00692/TCA - Beech (T1) - 30% crown reduction, Whitebeam (T2) - fell as growing into crown of adjacent beech, Group of beech (T3) - reduce by 30 - 40%, Birch (T4) - reduce by 30 - 40% to match T3 group of beech at Fiddlers Cottage, The Green, Urchfont, SN10 4RB – NO OBJECTION

6g. 20/09758/VAR - Removal of Condition 04 of planning permission K/45370 (Erection of dwelling and garage (Amendment to K/43042 previously approved) at Garden Cottage, High Street, Wedhampton, Devizes, Wiltshire, SN10 3QE – APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

7. Matters for Report

a. Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review Consultation – GD thanked TH for taking action to submit the UPC approved consultation response by the deadline which was prior to this meeting. An email had been received from Mr. Mottram (attached at Appendix 2 – on website version only) alleging that the comments he had submitted (at the request of UPC at their February meeting} on behalf of former council members had not been acknowledged, had not been considered by UPC as a whole, had not been incorporated into the UPC response to WC and effectively had been ignored by UPC. BL confirmed that he had verbally acknowledged receipt of the original email with Mr. Mottram within a couple of days and at the same time advised that the email had been forwarded to the Chairman and Lead of Planning. TH commented that some of the views submitted by Mr. Mottram et al appeared to be at odds with the approved UPC comments, he discussed this with GD and it was agreed that the comments received from Mr. Mottram would be submitted verbatim under 'further comments' within the UPC response. TH expressed surprise that Mr. Mottram et al had not actually submitted their own response directly to the WC consultation process as many others have done. Having to submit the UPC response prior to this meeting and having been delegated by Council to consider any comments submitted, GD believed that TH had correctly added the verbatim views submitted by Mr. Mottram et al. GD also entirely refuted the allegation that the comments made by Mr. Mottram had been ignored or metaphorically 'binned' by UPC.

b. Consideration of Planning Applications – TH stated that we are increasingly receiving consultation requests from WC with deadlines between UPC meetings. Whilst BL seeks extension of the dates in all such cases, these are not always granted and so we reluctantly have to submit a 'no comment'. Maybe now is the time to consider amending UPC Planning Policy to facilitate alternative arrangements for some of the minor applications such as TCA's with only maintenance proposals. TH asked that this issue be added to the agenda for the next meeting for further discussion, this was agreed. TH agreed to provide a paper on options prior to the next meeting. PW commented that if extensions are not granted by WC, especially for potentially controversial applications, this should be further pursued with a copy to him.

ACTION: PLANNING/04/21 - TH

c. Likely Solar Panel application to be installed in Manor Farmyard – LC gave a heads up that an application is likely to be submitted by a resident in Manor Farmyard for the installation of solar panels. LC believed that such alternative energy installations should be allowable but understands that covenants / planning conditions do not permit such installations. If this is the case, will WC consider refunding the £232 planning application fee. PW emphasized that such conditions / covenants are commonly applied in conservation areas to minimise the opportunity for proliferation of such systems.

Date of next scheduled Planning Meeting is Wednesday 14th April 2021.

APPENDIX 1 TO UPC DRAFT MINUTES OF MARCH 21 PLANNING MEETING

Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review Consultation – Written Report from Cllr Trevor Hill

I have responded to the Wiltshire Local Plan Consultation on behalf of UPC by giving the answers, as agreed at our UPC meeting 12th February, to the posed questions within the Empowering Rural Communities documents.

In response to a request at that meeting (12th February) for comments from members of the community the following report was received by UPC Clerk on 27th February 2021:

“Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review Consultation

Comments to UPC by Nicky Mitchell, Simon Holt, Bill Donald, and Dave Mottram as UPC and Steering Group members during the development of UWLNP

3) Clarification of Number of Houses Developed within the Parish

At the UPC meeting on 10th February, TH stated that the Wiltshire Council Local Plan Baseline indicative housing requirement 2016-2036 for Urchfont would require 65 properties to be developed, of which there are 60 Completions (2016-19) & Commitments (1 April 2019). Exactly which these 60 Completed and Committed properties are should be clearly understood. We might assume that they are:

<i>i)</i>	<i>Manor Farmyard</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>ii)</i>	<i>Sites 1 – 9 in UWLNP</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>iii)</i>	<i>Lydeaway Garage Site</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>4</i>

Although, it could be argued that the Manor Farmyard development was completed before 2016?

There have also been a couple of ‘windfall’ developments since the plan was written which will make up for any shortfall in sites included in the plan.

It is also worth noting that many villages in the Chippenham HMA are currently well below the baseline requirement.

2) The loss of smaller dwelling (2/3-bedroom dwellings) stock through property extensions

There is no doubt that a stock of 2/3 bedroom ‘first time buyer’ type properties is important to attract younger residents to village communities. It is also important to retain some of these residents as they get older and bring up families. One way of achieving this is to allow them to extend their properties as their family extends. This is a much cheaper option for them than moving to a larger property. It is also worth noting that the stock of slightly larger properties is also eroded by owners extending their properties for similar reasons of cost and need. We do not think this should be controlled by legislation, or even changes to the current legislation, but borne in mind when planning new developments. The need for affordable homes to be included in all developments of more than 5 properties addresses this problem directly.

3) Neighbourhood Plan Proforma

During the development of UWLNP, it became apparent that a proforma for the document would be particularly useful and would have saved the Steering Group a considerable amount of time. Since the plan reviews are not necessarily carried out by local examiners. It would also have made external reviews of the document at lot easier had all draft plans being similarly structured. I would go much further than suggest that WC produce this proforma but ask WC to put pressure on central government to produce such a proforma for use nationally.”

These comments have been added to the response under ‘further comments’ with the caveat that the views expressed are attributed to and entirely the responsibility of the 4 named authors.

Cllr Trevor Hill
Lead of Planning

APPENDIX 2 TO UPC DRAFT MINUTES OF MARCH 21 PLANNING MEETING

EMAIL RECEIVED BY UPC CHAIR & VICE CHAIR ON 9th MARCH 2021 FROM MR. DAVE MOTTRAM

Chair and Vice- chair,

Please can this email be discussed under agenda item 7a of the UPC Planning Meeting on 10th March. It appears that it is too late for UPC to discuss our comments.

Via the minutes of the UPC February Planning Meeting and the UPC Website we were requested to make comments on the Wiltshire Local Plan:

*'This is your opportunity to make any comment on the approved answers to the consultation questions in Appendix 2. **Please send any comments by email to Councillor Trevor Hill (trevorew@icloud.com) - by the 28th February 2021 at the latest.***

As you are aware comments were sent to UPC, by the deadline in the names of Nicky Mitchell, Bill Donald, Simon Holt and myself.

To date the only acknowledgement I have received is a verbal comment by Bob Lunn (UPC would be lost without him!) while discussing other matters. Bob simply stated that our comments had been appended to the UPC comments.

He did not mention the disclaimer added by the Lead Councillor for planning:

'These comments have been added to the response under 'further comments' with the caveat that the views expressed are attributed to and entirely the responsibility of the 4 named authors.'

As a resident of Urchfont, I expect to be represented by my local councillors and not to have councillor's totally distancing themselves from my input and views. Given that the authors names are already in the document, I consider this disclaimer to be totally superfluous. I am starting to feel that there may be an attempt on the part of certain members of UPC to marginalise the authors of this document – I hope I am wrong.

As a reader of this report I would take the view that at best UPC did not consider these comments as of any value, and had metaphorically 'binned' them.

So what has UPC done with our comments? Have they been distributed to other councillors, have they been discussed?

Are UPC listening to the views of residents, the very people that elected you to represent them?

I look forward to your response.

Regards,

Dave M