

## Northern Area Planning Committee

---

### MINUTES OF THE NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 4 MARCH 2020 AT COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, MONKTON PARK, CHIPPENHAM, SN15 1ER.

#### **Present:**

Cllr Tony Trotman (Chairman), Cllr Peter Hutton (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Chuck Berry, Cllr Christine Crisp, Cllr Gavin Grant, Cllr Howard Greenman, Cllr Mollie Groom, Cllr Chris Hurst, Cllr Toby Sturgis, Cllr Ashley O'Neill and Cllr Ruth Hopkinson (Substitute)

#### **Also Present:**

Cllr Ben Anderson

---

#### 11 **Apologies**

Apologies were received from Cllr Brian Mathew.

Cllr Brian Mathew was substituted by Cllr Ruth Hopkinson.

#### 12 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2020 were presented.

#### **Resolved:**

**To approve as a true and correct record and sign the minutes.**

#### 13 **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Ashley O'Neill declared an interest in agenda item no. 7b (he grew up in Lacock and a resident sharing the same surname objected to the application, though this was not someone he knew personally). He declared he would participate in the debate and vote for each item with an open mind.

#### 14 **Chairman's Announcements**

There were no Chairman's announcements.

#### 15 **Public Participation**

The Committee noted the rules on public participation.

16 **Planning Appeals and Updates**

The Committee noted the contents of the appeals update.

17 **Planning Applications**

The Committee considered the following applications:

18 **19/09183/FUL & 19/09407/LBC - 57 High Street, Corsham**

Public participation

Lesley Jefferson, local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

Rebecca Palmer, local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

Ben Pearce, Land Development & Planning Consultants Ltd, spoke in objection to the application.

Richard Harlow, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Officer, Simon Smith, introduced a report which recommended granting planning permission and listed building consent, subject to conditions, for the demolition of an existing single storey extension and the erection of a replacement single storey extension with internal works.

Attention was drawn to the late list of observations provided at the meeting and attached to these minutes.

Key issues highlighted included: principle of the development; impact upon neighbour amenity; highways and parking; heritage and scale of extension.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer which focused on: compatibility with adjoining businesses; lack of rear access; the size and scale of extension; impact on the adjoining residential property; impact on the listed building and whether the application falls into A1 retail use class.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to address the Committee, as detailed above.

Cllr Ruth Hopkinson, Division Member, spoke regarding the application with the main points focusing on: compatibility with adjoining businesses; lack of rear access; ventilation and odours; traffic and parking concerns; hazardous waste; overdevelopment of the site; impact on the listed building; impact on a historical and heritage site; the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan; impact on local amenity and the lack of engagement from the applicant.

The Planning Officer addressed some of the issues raised by the public and local members with the main points focusing on: whether the application falls

into A1 retail use class; whether the application sought a change of use; hazardous waste; mechanical ventilation and the applicant's hours of work.

At the start of the debate a proposal was moved by Cllr Peter Hutton, seconded by Cllr Toby Sturgis, to grant planning permission as detailed in the report.

During the debate the main points raised were: whether the application falls into A1 retail use class; traffic and parking concerns; applicant engagement with residents; the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan; the design of the application; impact on the listed building; the scale of the application; similar applications in nearby towns; impact on the conservation area; whether the application sought a change of use; compatibility with adjoining businesses; lack of rear access and impact on the adjoining residential property.

Following the debate, the motion was defeated.

A proposal was then moved by Cllr Gavin Grant, seconded by Cllr Howard Greenman, to refuse planning permission contrary to the officer's report.

This motion was carried.

A proposal was then moved by Cllr Gavin Grant, seconded by Cllr Chris Hurst, to refuse listed building consent contrary to the officer's report.

This motion was also carried.

## **Resolved**

**That planning permission and Listed Building Consent be refused for the following reason:**

### **19/09183/FUL:**

**By reason of its design, scale and extent to which it fills the rear yard, the proposed extension is considered to harm the character and appearance of the listed building to which it would be attached. That harm is not outweighed by any identified public benefit and the proposed development is therefore considered to fail the requirements of policy CP57 (iii) and (iv) and policy CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy as well as policy HE1 of the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2026 and relevant paragraphs in sections 12 and 16 to the NPPF.**

### **19/09407/LBC:**

**By reason of its design, scale and extent to which it fills the rear yard, the proposed extension is considered to harm the character and appearance of the listed building to which it would be attached. That harm is not outweighed by any identified public benefit and the proposed development is therefore considered to fail the requirements of policy CP57 (iii) and (iv) and policy CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy as well as**

**policy HE1 of the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2026 and relevant paragraphs in sections 12 and 16 to the NPPF.**

19 **19/08542/FUL and 19/08758/LBC - Sundawn, Chapel Hill, Lacock, Chippenham**

Public participation

Mark Funnel, the National Trust, spoke in objection to the application.

Des Seal, local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

Mark Johns, the applicant, spoke in support to the application.

Samuel Croft, the agent, spoke in support to the application.

John Bolden, Vice-Chair of Lacock Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application.

The Planning Officer, Simon Smith, introduced a report which recommended granting planning permission and listed building consent, subject to conditions, for a proposed ground floor and upper ground floor extension.

Attention was drawn to the late list of observations provided at the meeting and attached to these minutes.

Key issues highlighted included: principle of development; design and scale; impact upon a listed building and the conservation area; impact on residential amenity and highways and parking.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer which focused on: the design and scale of the application and the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces and their design.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to address the Committee, as detailed above.

Cllr Ben Anderson, Division Member, spoke regarding the application with the main points focusing on: the massing, size and scale of the application; the unique and distinctive character of the local area; the impact on the wider area; overdevelopment of the site; impact on neighbourhood amenity; impact on the listed building and the lack of public benefit.

The Planning Officer addressed some of the issues raised by the public and local members with the main point focusing on the Committee's responsibility to compare the applications harm with its public benefit.

At the start of the debate a proposal was moved by Cllr Peter Hutton, seconded by Cllr Tony Trotman to grant planning permission as detailed in the report and subject to additional conditions regarding the construction of external surfaces.

During the debate the main points raised were: the public benefit of the application; the impact on neighbouring residential properties; the size and scale of the application; the impact on the Old Chapel; the construction of the external surfaces and their design; impact on neighbour amenity; impact upon a listed building and the conservation area; the unique and distinctive character of the local area and the weight of the views of those that are entrusted with the area's conservation.

Following the debate, the motion was defeated.

A proposal was then moved by Cllr Grant, seconded by Cllr Greenman, to refuse planning permission contrary to the officer's report.

This motion was carried.

A proposal was then moved by Cllr Grant, seconded by Cllr Greenman, to refuse listed building consent, contrary to the officer's report.

This motion was also carried.

### **Resolved**

**That planning permission and Listed Building Consent be refused for the following reason:**

#### **19/0842/FUL:**

**By reason of its design, massing, height above the existing roof and materials to be used, the box shaped garage extension element of the proposal would be out of character in the Conservation Area and in the context of surrounding Listed Buildings. Accordingly, the development is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality and surrounding Listed Buildings and that harm would not be outweighed by any identified public benefits. The proposed development fails the requirements of policy CP57 (iii) and (iv) and policy CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy as well as relevant paragraphs in sections 12 and 16 to the NPPF.**

#### **19/08758/LBC:**

**By reason of its design, massing, height above the existing roof and materials to be used, the box shaped garage extension element of the proposal would be out of character in the context of the Listed Building to which it would relate. Accordingly, the works are considered to be harmful to the setting of the Listed Building and that harm would not be outweighed by any identified public benefits. The proposed works fail the requirements of policy CP57 (iii) and (iv) and policy CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy as well as relevant paragraphs in sections 12 and 16 to the NPPF.**

20 **19/10769/FUL - Ranch House Farm, Bath Road, Colerne**

Public participation

Gary Brain, local resident, spoke in support to the application.

The Planning Officer, Simon Smith, introduced a report which recommended refusing planning permission for the erection of an open timber cart barn.

Key issues highlighted included: principle of development; appropriateness of development in a green belt site and harm to the openness; impact on rural landscape and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; residential amenity and highways safety.

There were no technical questions.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to address the Committee, as detailed above.

Cllr Ruth Hopkinson, on behalf of the Division Member, spoke regarding the application with the main points focusing on: the material differences of the application to a previously refused scheme; that it was in keeping with surrounding architecture; tree retention; the lack of objection and the support of the parish council and the covering of parked cars within the estate.

The Planning Officer addressed some of the issues raised by the public and local members with the main point focusing on permitted development rights.

At the start of the debate a proposal was moved by Cllr Tony Trotman, seconded by Cllr Christine Crisp to refuse planning permission as detailed in the report.

During the debate the main points raised were: the impact on the rural landscape and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the appropriateness of development on a green belt site.

**Resolved**

**That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:**

- 1. The proposed building is considered to represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful. The proposal is contrary to Section 13, paragraphs 143, 144, 145 & 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. The proposal, by reason of its scale and location, would result in an intrusive element, encroaching into the countryside contrary to Core Strategy Policy 51 criteria ii, iii vi & ix that require the protection of important landscape character and Core Strategy Policy 57 criteria i,**

**iii & vi which requires development to respond to landscape features and relate well to its surroundings. It is also contrary to Section 12, paragraph 127 and Section 15, paragraph 172, of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

21 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 3.00 pm – 6.00 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Craig Player of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 713191, e-mail [craig.player@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:craig.player@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

This page is intentionally left blank



## NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

**4<sup>th</sup> March 2020**

This is information that has been received since the committee report was written. This could include additional comments or representation, new information relating to the site, changes to plans etc.

### **Agenda Item 7a – 19/09183/FUL & 19/09407/LBC – 57 High Street, Corsham**

#### **Officer note:**

Incorrect reference is made at various points in the report to policy HE3 of the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan. The correct policy number is in fact policy HE1.

All considerations and conclusions should be made using reference to policy HE1 to the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan.

### **Agenda Item 7b – 19/08542/FUL and 19/08758/LBC – Sundawn, Chapel Hill, Lacock**

#### **Officer note:**

##### *Ground level*

The report references a c.500mm in the ground level of the existing garden as a result of development taking place. The applicant claims that the increase in ground level is in fact some 370mm.

Revised plans were submitted to reflect the true increase in ground level. In view of the reduction in the expected ground level increase and the fact that in all other respects the plans remain unchanged, the recommendation does not alter.

In the event that the Committee resolves to grant planning permission, condition 03 to 19/08542/FUL and condition 02 to 19/08758/LBC should be amended to refer to the following plans:

Drg no. 007:001:A Proposed Site Plan  
Drg no. 007:002 :A Proposed Ground Floor Plan  
Drg no. 007:003:A Proposed First Floor Plan  
(Received by LPA 27 Nov 2019)

Drg no. 007-004 South Elevation  
Drg no. 007-005 West Elevation  
Drg no. 007-006 East Elevation  
Drg no. 007-007 Section North  
Drg no. 007-008 Section West  
Drg no. 007-009 Section AA  
Drg no. 007-AN1 Garden Section (Longitudinal)  
Drg no. 007-AN3 Garden Section (Transverse)  
(Received by LPA 04 March 2019)

### *Existing garage*

It has emerged that the survey and proposed drawings submitted by the applicant incorrectly depict the eaves and ridge height of the garage as being taller than they are in reality.

Corrected drawings have now been received as well as a confirmation that the proposal does not involve the demolition, rebuilding or increasing in height of the existing element of the garage in any way. The proposed extension to the garage will remain at 600mm above existing ridge height as already reported.

Since the proposal does not change the existing element of the garage, the impact upon No.4 Chapel Hill (the nearest neighbour) is as per that set out in the report and the recommendation is unchanged.

The applicant has, however, confirmed that they would be content to accept a planning condition which, for the avoidance of doubt, expressly prohibits any raising of height of the existing element of the garage and to specify the maximum extent of its extension. For this reason, in the event the Committee resolves to grant planning permission, the following condition should be added to 19/08542/FUL:

07 The proposed development shall result in no increase in ridge or eaves height of the existing element of the garage above existing. Further, the above ground extension to the existing garage shall extend to a point no more than 600m above the existing ridge height of the garage.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and so as to protect the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties.

### *National Trust*

Although not a statutory consultee for development such as this, the National Trust own a substantial number of properties and land at Lacock. The NT have decided to make representations on these two applications. Perhaps incorrectly omitted from being referenced in the report, their comments are repeated below in full:

*The National Trust is a charity and Europe's largest conservation organisation, which is responsible for the protection of some of the most beautiful, historically important and environmentally sensitive places in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. The Trust has a statutory duty under the National Trust Acts to promote the conservation of these places.*

*The Trust acts as a custodian of the picturesque and historic village of Lacock. This landholding comprises around 131 hectares of land and over 100 individual buildings, many of which are listed, including the grade I listed Lacock Abbey. Near to the application property (Sundawn), the Trust owns no. 3 Cantax Hill, a grade II listed dwelling.*

*In response to the current planning application, we are very concerned about the scale, extent and wider impacts of the proposed extension. The extension would have a considerable footprint, joining the dwelling and the outbuilding. This would take up a large area of the property's garden and involve significant excavation work and alteration to existing land levels. Furthermore, the extension incorporates a two-storey element that projects upwards as a rectangular box-like structure, which would be visible in wider views, including from Cantax Hill.*

*Whilst we note the reference in the planning application to the needs of modern family life, the application property is a grade II listed building, and we do not consider that the proposed extension responds sensitively to the existing dwelling, or its setting. It should also be noted that the property is surrounded by four other listed buildings (including 3 Cantax Hill) and lies within the Lacock Conservation Area. We do not consider that the proposed extension would conserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In our view it would clearly be out of scale and character and would represent the over-development of the property.*

*In conclusion, the National Trust objects to the planning application, and we would ask that our comments and concerns are fully considered before the application comes to be determined.*

Please note that the substantive issues raised by the National Trust have been considered within the report and the recommendation remains unchanged.

This page is intentionally left blank