



DRAFT Minutes of the Urchfont Parish Council (UPC) Planning Meeting held in Urchfont Village Hall on Tuesday 14th July 2021

Present: Councillors: Botham (MB - Chairman), Hollyman (MH – Vice Chairman), Bamber (SB), Turner (MT), Stevens (DS), Holt (SH) and Moscrop (PM)

Clerk to the Council: Lunn (BL)

Councillor for Urchfont & Bishops Cannings: Whitehead (PW)

Members of the Public (for all or part of the meeting): Mrs B Potter, Mr. B Donald, Mr. S Payne-Kumar, Mr. P Askins, Mr. M Smith, Mr. T Hill

1. Declarations of Interest – SH declared non-pecuniary interests in items 4b and 4c, MB declared a pecuniary interest in Item 4d.

2. Minutes of a meeting held on 8th June 2021

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
To approve and sign the minutes unchanged as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	MT	MH	AGREED with 2 abstentions (1 absent from last meeting, the other a new councillor)

3. Matters arising from Minutes of 8th June 2021 – None raised

4. Plans for discussion

4a. PL/2021/04264 - Outline application with all matters reserved for erection of 6no. dwellings (2no. affordable starter home dwellings) and associated development on Land South of Bell House, Lydeaway, Wilts, SN10 3PS for Planning Base Ltd, Blandford Forum (With approval of the Case Officer - Consultation deadline extended from 7th to 15th July 2021)

Site Visit – 13th July by three councillors who met the applicant

Representations – Four representations on the WC website

MT explained that two previous applications had been rejected by WC Planning and subsequently on appeal as unsustainable. The site is next to a potentially dangerous main road and junction, is within an AONB and was not included in the UWLNP (Urchfont, Wedhampton and Lydeaway Neighbourhood Plan).

Mr. Hill was invited to speak. Mr. Hill pointed out that the applicant is a planning consultancy who specialises in difficult developments, this is only an outline planning application with no detail of each house to be built. The site was not included in the NWLNP and he believed that supporting the application would undermine the current neighbourhood plan. However, the application does raise important questions such as why it might be considered a bad or inappropriate location for a new development. He went on to highlight that WC are currently changing their planning criteria and cited a booklet which is seeking to empower rural communities, this includes indications of how many house this Parish will be expected to build by 2036. WC want evidence based information to support and qualify these expectations. Mr. Hill suggested that it is only when the Parish accept this site for new build development that UPC could support an application, he encouraged UPC not to support now.

Mr. Donald added that this site might have been included in the current UWLNP if it had not been rejected by WC previously. He believed that it will be good to increase the housing stock in Lydeaway in the future but the concept needs further community consultation.

SH reiterated that an application for this site was turned down in 2014, refused again in 2015 and further rejected on appeal. Unusually the appeal decision did not give any indication of how a future application could overcome concerns. He also stated that the site failed in securing a place in the UWLNP. SH urged councillors to OBJECT to this application.

PW commented that all neighbourhood plans allow for windfall development proposals and approval of such proposals does not damage a plan. The current core strategy is being replaced by the new local plan which allows for small plot and minor development amongst other things. This application presents a catch 22 situation where a good deal of local services are available very nearby (Farm shop, hairdresser, coffee shop, flower shop and exercise facilities) but the site is nevertheless considered unsustainable. He believed that the application will be refused by WC at this stage.

MH asked what does unsustainability mean? PW said that this could be considered use of a definition for definition sake, Lydeaway could be considered more sustainable than most but could nevertheless still be rejected on this basis. SH commented that the previous appeal report did not state what the three rules of sustainability are, but nevertheless found the site and application unsustainable. It is important to also note that Ostler’s Yard was a brown field site, this application is on a green field site.

SB emphasised the dangers of the adjacent A342 and speed of traffic, she did not believe this to be an ideal site for development despite previous development at Ostler’s Yard.

MB expressed sympathy for the comments made by Mr. Donald, this application will offer affordable homes which the community needs but it is not in the current UWLNP and is in an AONB. Maybe it is not the right time to support this application pending further community consultation as part of the update of the Plan.

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	Resolution
To OBJECT to this application on the grounds that the site is not in the UWLNP, it is in an AONB and gives insufficient detail of what is being proposed. However, a future application may be considered at a later date dependent on community consultation as part of the neighbourhood plan updating.	MT	SB	AGREED – 4 votes in favour, three against

4b. PL/2021/05714 - Consent under Tree Preservation Orders - T 1 Beech Reduce over extended limbs over the road by 4m & reduce in height by 3-4m at suitable growth points & crown lift to 4m over the garden at LIME TREE COTTAGE, MANOR CLOSE, URCHFONT, DEVIZES, SN10 4RE for Mr. P Baker
(With approval of the Case Officer, consultation deadline extended to 15th July.)

Site Visit 13th July by two councillors who met the applicant
Representations: None

MT explained the proposal and confirmed that the site visit could see no reason for this necessary work not to proceed. It was noted that Blackboard Lane would probably need to be closed when works take place.

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	Resolution
NO OBJECTION	MT	MB	AGREED unanimously

4c. PL/2021/05125 - Part retrospective application for trellis style curved panel boundary fence. Stepped timber sleeper retainers and planting of Laurel instant hedge to top step (outside of fence). Installation of post and rail chain link fence and hedge to remainder of garden boundary at Timbers Plum Lane Wedhampton Devizes SN10 3RR for Mr. P Askins and Mc C Hamp

Site Visit 13th July by three councillors who met the applicant and a neighbour
Representations: 14 on the WC website, 13 in favour and one expressing concerns

Having already discussed their application with councillors at the site visit, Mr Askins was invited to speak. Having taken lay advice, Mr. Askins acknowledged that he had not followed, but was not avoiding, the correct planning procedure for works to be undertaken within the curtilage of a listed building. The previous leylandii hedge, rising 12 to 18 foot high

and some 8 foot wide along the boundary of his house, was causing considerable damp within the house structure. It was never his intention to build what might be perceived by some as a stockade to replace the hedge, he is committed to planting a new laurel hedge. He maintained that his household had a right to privacy and security and so had constructed the fence and initiated planting to satisfy this right. He thanked local Wedhampton residents for the support they had expressed.

MT commented that councillors on the site visit had also visited a neighbour living at Mortons who does not object as such but has concerns that if approved these works could set a detrimental precedent for others in the community.

MT was of the view that the old hedge should have been removed for the reasons stated by Mr. Askins, that the colour of the new fence will mature in time and will eventually be replaced by the laurel hedging.

Proposal	Proposer		Seconded	Resolution
To SUPPORT this application	MT		MB	AGREED with one abstention

4d. PL/2021/05328 - Group of oak (T1) - 20 - 30% crown reduction/shape to match height of all trees in group. Cherry (T2) - crown clean Western red cedar (T3) - reduce by 30% and shape Group of holly and hazel (T4) - reduce by 40 /50% to match natural line seen from neighbouring property Birch (T5) - crown raise by up to 5m over garden/driveway and reduce limbs extending towards property to give minimum 4m clearance Beech (T6) - crown raise by up to 5m over garden/driveway and reduce limbs extending towards property to give minimum 4m clearance. Holly (T7) - reduce by 30% back to trim line and shape Robinia (T8) - crown clean at Beech House, High Street, Urchfont, Devizes, SN10 4QN for Mr. Botham

(Note - This application was considered on the 8th June 2021 but because the meeting was not quorate the NO OBJECTION recommendation needs to be ratified at this meeting.)

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
To RATIFY the NO OBJECTION recommendation made at the meeting on 8 th June 2021	MT	MH	AGREED Unanimously

5. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council up to 11th July 2021

5a. 21/01195/VAR - Removal of condition 2 of E/11/0123/FUL to allow the building to be occupied as a separate dwelling from the main house at Green Farm, The Green, Urchfont, SN10 4RB APPROVE with Conditions

5b. PL/2021/03668 - Works to a Listed Building - Garage conversion, installation of flue, new store & alterations to West End House West End House, The Green, Urchfont, SN10 4RB APPROVE with Conditions

5c. 21/02484/FUL - Full Planning Permission for Garage conversion, installation of flue, relocation of existing oil tank, erection of screen around relocated oil tank, creation of new pedestrian access, creation of new vehicular access, new store, removal of 1no. Cherry Tree & alterations to West End House at West End House, The Green, Urchfont, SN10 4RB – APPROVE with conditions

5d. PL/2021/05328 - Group of oak (T1) - 20 - 30% crown reduction/shape to match height of all trees in group. Cherry (T2) - crown clean Western red cedar (T3) - reduce by 30% and shape Group of holly and hazel (T4) - reduce by 40 /50% to match natural line seen from neighbouring property Birch (T5) - crown raise by up to 5m over garden/driveway and reduce limbs extending towards property to give minimum 4m clearance Beech (T6) - crown raise by up to 5m over garden/driveway and reduce limbs extending towards property to give minimum 4m clearance. Holly (T7) - reduce by 30% back to trim line and shape Robinia (T8) - crown clean at Beech House, High Street, Urchfont, Devizes, SN10 4QN – NO OBJECTION

6. Matters for Report including:

- i. **Works at Yew Tree Cottage, Urchfont** – Following comments at the June meeting, MT had referred this matter to the WC Enforcement Team and also advised the owner of this action. An email from the WC Planning Enforcement Officer today advised that he had visited the site and having spoken to the owner believed that no breach of planning control had occurred. Furthermore, if there is actual evidence that the bank has been further excavated then this would be a civil matter not planning issue.

Date of Next Scheduled Meeting: 11th August 2021 (If Required)