

# Wootton Rivers Parish Council

## Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2020 (Remote Meeting held on-line using Zoom platform)

<b>Present:</b>	Cindy Creasy	Parish Council Chair
	David Butler	Parish Council Vice Chair
	Clare Bamforth	Councillor
	Dean Cowley	Councillor
	Nick Jones	Councillor
	Steve Rawlings	Councillor
	Anne Swift	Councillor
	Neil Worthington	Clerk

Cindy Creasy welcomed councillors and members of the public to the first virtual meeting of the Parish Council as authorised by the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 issued during the current Coronavirus pandemic. The previous meeting scheduled for 16<sup>th</sup> March 2020 had been cancelled following advice received from the Government and Wiltshire Council to avoid all unnecessary meetings.

### **1. Declarations of Interest and the granting of dispensations.**

Councillors were reminded of the Code for Conduct and the need to declare any interest relating to the items on the Agenda. Dean Cowley and Anne Swift both declared an interest in item 4.2 of the Agenda – planning applications 20/00606/FUL and 20/01439/LBC and withdrew from the meeting while this item was considered.

### **2. Finances**

The following payments which had been made by BACS since the previous meeting were authorised;

Wessex Print invoice 54741 for printing Contact - £21.00

T McGarry for purchase of sports equipment - £53.08

Turner Land Care invoice 1527 for tree work Recreation Ground - £780.00

Idverde invoice GM778764 for grass cutting Recreation Ground - £276.38

It was confirmed that the BEAM rebate had been received - £727.18

The Council's financial year ended on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2020 and accounts can now be finalised for the auditing although the period for publishing the Audit has been extended by 2 months.

### **3 .Planning**

The following applications received since the last meeting had been determined by the clerk acting as the delegated officer

20/00613/TCA      Tree work at Somersets Farm – approved  
20/00887/TCA      Tree work at Periton – approved

It was noted that a further application 20/00781/TCA for tree work at Vale Cottage had not been considered as no notice had been received from Wiltshire Council during a period when there were major problems with their website. This application had been approved by Wiltshire but as the application was for normal tree management the PC would have supported it.

An application for Discharge of Conditions regarding application 20/00884/LBC at Mulberry House was to have been considered at the cancelled meeting. It was confirmed that the PC submitted a No Comment response and deferred to the planning and conservation officer to make the decision as the conditions being discharged only related to joinery details and approval of materials.

### **Procedure for future applications**

Following discussion, it was agreed that applications for minor building works received under the current lockdown regulations should be delegated to the Clerk to decide in the same way that tree works are currently dealt with. This will include issuing the application to all councillors for their comments, which would be taken into account by the Clerk. If any councillor believes that the application cannot be classed as minor then the application would have to come before the whole council in a virtual public meeting.

This delegation of powers would be subject to review as conditions change.

### **19/11140/FUL Revised drawings for house at Church Farm**

Following the unsuccessful Appeal against the design shown in application 19/03278/FUL a further application 19/11140/FUL of a more contemporary design had been submitted in December 2019. WRPC had submitted their comments objecting to this application and understand that the planning authority also had reservations about aspects of the design. An alternative design had now been received under the same application number.

Comments on this application from Councillors and the residents present were invited and were as follows:-

- the height, footprint and scale of the design were similar to the previously consented building and therefore kept to the spirit of the original design and the omission of the chimneys and large corner glazing and the removal of the large areas of brickwork were welcomed
- there was no indication of the materials being proposed – eg walls, roof, framework, dormers, windows/doors etc
- the framework shown appeared oversize
- the glazed gable walls and dormer windows did not reflect the original barn like design
- the design with the large dormers reflected a creep towards a 2-storey building rather than the consented 1.5 storey design
- there was no change to the access directly from the road through the north entrance which could enable this development to be completed without the

front site being developed. There was concern about the applicant's final plans for the whole site if the North access was used

- concerns about the windows to the end elevations which were excessively large for en-suite bathrooms and whether there could be subsequent changes made to the internal layout which would not need planning permission
- the garage was now a larger 3 bay building – it was thought that this was for plant but no details have been provided – ground source heat pumps did not require much plant room
- too much glass generally causing light pollution
- the garage was outside of the building line in open countryside – this could create a precedent for future development
- the Design and Access Statement had not been updated to reflect the design changes
- the lack of detail on the drawings was generally felt to be disrespectful when the applicants know the importance of this site to the community – the preference would be to use clay roof tiles, oak windows and doors, black metal flue
- Ensuite windows should be reduced in size, opaque glass specified and non-openable
- Noted that garage would not be visible as tucked behind 2 semi-detached houses
- No details of foul drain package had been supplied and it was noted that the Wiltshire drainage engineer had already commented on this and suggested connecting to main sewer in the road – there was concern regarding the possibility of contamination of water course on site if a package system was used
- There was the possibility of surface water attenuation for the entire site being sited in this plot – there were no details provided and any scheme would need to be signed off by Wiltshire and Wessex Water before building commenced
- It was noted that if the house design was handed the garage could be located within the build line as shown in the original consent
- Residents living north of the site closest to the house preferred the garage location as drawn as it provided a barrier between them and the house
- Views through the development to the countryside beyond were not maintained as the NP had suggested – although this was noted to be an aspiration not a requirement
- Concern was expressed as to what was the applicants final design for the whole site as it was felt that further amendments to the consented scheme could still be being considered
- Dimensioned plans and levels should be provided so that there could be no creeping enlargement of the building – eg ridge / eaves heights, floor area should be defined
- Consent for the 2 sites needed to be combined especially now in view of the likelihood that the foul and surface water drainage were being interrelated – this needs to be resolved before commencement on site
- Permitted Development Rights should be removed so that any amendments etc would need approval
- The issue of separating the site into 2 ownerships had still not been addressed by the planners as the large house was only consented to provide viability for the overall site

Following further discussions on all the points raised Cindy Creasy proposed that the PC response should be to:-

- welcome the changes that have been made to the design shown on the revised drawings which addressed some of the issues previously raised. However, because the issues regarding access, building outside the build line, the viability issue and the total lack of detailed information there is no alternative but to Object to this application, but also to make the comment that if additional information was presented that gave further details of exactly what was being proposed the parish council may be able to support the application in the future.

The motion was seconded by Steve Rawlings and supported unanimously. It was agreed that a formal response would be drafted for comments by councillors urgently to enable it to be issued to the community by 16<sup>th</sup> April as the latest date for commenting on the application was 20<sup>th</sup> April 2020.

#### **20/00606/FUL and 20/01439/LBC Garage building at Somersets Farm**

Before leaving the meeting Anne Swift, who was the architect, advised that the design as drawn required lowering the floor level by 0.5m in order to keep the new ridge height the same as the existing building, but that this may not be possible to avoid damaging the roots of the large walnut tree. Revisions to the foundations had also been necessary for the same reason.

Comments on this application from Councillors and residents present were invited and were as follows: -

- It was considered that the design would be an improvement over the existing building
- The appearance from the street would be very similar to the existing building
- It was noted that the Conservation Officer would be advising as to the importance and treatment of brickwork to the rear of the site that may relate to the properties former farm usage.
- Nearby residents had no concerns except for the inclusion of rooflights to the rear facing roof which may cause light pollution but it was considered that this could be addressed by the use of integral black out blinds.

Following further discussions on the points raised, Cindy Creasy proposed that the PC response should be to support this application.

The motion was seconded by Steve Rawlings and supported unanimously.

#### **4. Other Urgent matters**

There were no urgent matters but the following matters were raised:-

- There may be some sort of village activity to mark the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of VE Day but obviously conducted in accordance with the social distancing rules
- The play equipment had been taken out of use but access was still possible to the Recreation Ground for exercise
- The towpath remains open but people should take notice of the C&RT notices posted and be careful when passing occupied boats

- The Demolition Permit for Church Farm had been approved for the whole site and the PC had been in contact with the owners asking to be notified of the start date for this phase. It was noted that they had to carry out a nesting bird survey 2 weeks before commencement although there is no requirement for this to be published or checked by the local authority.

**5. Dates of the next meeting – No further meeting were planned and would only be held when necessary to discharge the Council’s statutory duties or were needed to address other urgent or important items which had arisen.**

Confirmation has been received that the recently issued legislation has removed the necessity to hold the Annual Meeting or AGM this year, and that the period for the publication of final audited accounts has been extended until 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020.