

Eastern Area Planning Committee

MINUTES OF THE EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 30 JANUARY 2020 AT WESSEX ROOM, CORN EXCHANGE, MARKET PLACE, DEVIZES.

Present:

Cllr Mark Connolly (Chairman), Cllr Paul Oatway QPM (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling, Cllr Stewart Dobson, Cllr Nick Fogg MBE, Cllr Richard Gamble and Cllr James Sheppard

1. **Apologies**

Apologies were received from:

- Cllr Peter Evans.

2. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2019 were considered and it was;

Resolved:

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

3. **Declarations of Interest**

Declarations of interest were received from:

- Cllr Richard Gamble declared an interest in agenda item 7a, 19/10245/VAR - Dauntsey's School, High Street, West Lavington, SN10 4HE. Cllr Gamble declared that he would not take part in the debate or vote on this item.
- Cllr Mark Connolly, for the sake of transparency declared an interest in agenda item 7c, 19/10636/FUL - 116 High Street, Marlborough, Wiltshire, SN18 1LZ, as he was a member of the Conservative Party and the site had previously been used as a Conservative Club. He declared that he would consider the application with an open mind whilst he debated and voted on the item.

4. **Chairman's Announcements**

There were no announcements.

5. **Public Participation**

The rules on public participation were noted.

6. **Planning Appeals and Updates**

The report on completed and pending appeals was presented for consideration.

Resolved:

To note the updates.

7. **Planning Applications**

The following planning applications were considered.

8. **19/10245/VAR - Dauntsey's School, High Street, West Lavington, SN10 4HE**

Public Participation

Mr Stephen Herniman, spoke in objection to the application.

Mr William Blumsom, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Mark Lascelles – Headmaster, Dauntsey's School spoke in support of the application.

Ms Cat White – Agent, spoke in support of the application.

Morgan Jones, Senior Planning Officer, presented a report which recommended that planning permission be granted with conditions for the variation of condition 2 of planning permission K/42974 (change of use from agricultural land to use of playing fields and outdoor sports facilities) to allow for different surface material for outdoor sports track, with proposed landscaping to reduce visual impact (resubmission of refused application ref 18/11759/VAR).

The officer explained that this was a retrospective application. Unfortunately, there had been a misinterpretation of the original planning permission and a synthetic surface was used for the running track. This was red and was surrounded by a white fence. The application was a resubmission of refused application 18/11759/VAR, which was considered at committee in April 2019 and was refused due to the adverse impact it caused on the appearance and character of the area.

Maps and plans of the track were shown to members of the committee during the meeting. The application sought to address the previous reasons for refusal. It proposed a series of mitigation measures to reduce the impact of the development on the landscape. Plans of the proposed landscape mitigation were also shown during the meeting. Although these plans would not screen the track in its entirety the Wiltshire Council Landscape Officer had no objections. It was also proposed that the surrounding fence be painted grey as from a distance this would help it blend in to the landscape.

Photos of the track were shown during the meeting. From the same level the track and fence were hard to see. On byways at higher levels and from Strawberry Hill the track and fence could be seen, although it should be seen in context as part of the school and was set against the backdrop of the school and surrounding village.

The West Lavington Neighbourhood Plan supports the expansion or alteration of educational facilities or community facilities at Dauntsey's School but also seeks to ensure new development respected local character and is designed to integrate well with its surroundings.

The athletics track would be a valuable facility to the School and wider community and would contribute towards one of the aims of both national and local planning policy which was to enable and support healthy lifestyles through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure and sports facilities.

On balance the officers recommend that the application be approved with conditions.

Members of the committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. In response the officer stated that the photo shown of the track was a real photograph, not a computer-generated image. The officer explained that the wider community benefit of allowing the public to use the track was not part of a formal agreement as part of the application or approval. It was stated that if the school wished to provide lighting for the track this would be subject to a new planning application.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views, as detailed above.

Cllr Mark Connolly proposed a motion to follow the officer's recommendation to approve the application with conditions, this was seconded by Cllr James Sheppard.

A debate followed where the following issues were discussed.

Some councillors thought that the school had addressed some of the concerns and reasons for refusal, although it would take time for the proposed landscaping to grow. It was stated in the application that when the track came to the end of its life and was renewed the school may change the colour of the track, this was welcomed. The track was of benefit to the community and should be considered an asset. Therefore, they felt able to support the application.

Others stated that Dauntsey's School had not represented themselves well at the last committee meeting. They were grateful to the headmaster for coming, speaking and apologising on this occasion. However, they were still anxious about the planting. The track record of the school had not been good in that regard. A plan to mitigate the appearance of the development subject to the original planning application to change the use of the land from agriculture to

recreation had been developed years ago but had not been implemented. Therefore, it was suggested that an informative be added to the conditions requesting that the school provided progress reports to Wiltshire Council and West Lavington Parish Council on the progress of the mitigation measures. The planning officer was asked whether this would be possible. In response it was stated that the conditions already specified that the planting be implemented within a timescale, but it would be possible to add the informative requested.

Some councillors felt that the gap in the differences of opinion had narrowed but that the fence seemed to be a sticking point. It was asked whether the fence was necessary. The officer explained that Sport England would prefer the fence to remain in place in order to keep spectators and athletes safe.

In response to another question regarding the details of what was to be planted, including the numbers and size of the trees, it was stated that a detailed landscaping plan had been submitted as part of the application which contained the requested details and officers had been happy with the plan.

It was proposed that the current motion be amended to include an informative to the school to provide reports to Wiltshire Council and to liaise with West Lavington Parish Council on the possibility of further planting which was offered by the Headmaster during the meeting.

It was;

Resolved:

That the motion be amended to include an informative as suggested.

At the conclusion of the debate it was;

Resolved:

That planning permission be granted with conditions, as per the officer recommendation, with the addition of an informative to the applicant to provide reports to Wiltshire Council and West Lavington Parish Council on the progress of the mitigation planting.

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- **Drawing no. 1 001 Issue A (Mercers Field Proposed Site Location Plan), received 07.11.19;**
- **Drawing ref. Figure 4 (Revised landscape strategy with additional detailed planting proposals), received 07.11.19;**
- **Drawing no. 1743 2710 Issue C (Proposed Planting Plan), received 07.02.19 (originally under application 18/11759/VAR);**
- **Document no. 1743-2960 Rev A (Tree & Planting Schedules), received 07.02.19 (originally under application 18/11759/VAR);**
- **Drawing no. MCA-MUK1801-01 Rev E (Setting Out as Built), received 18.11.19;**

- Drawing no. MCA-MUK1801-02 Rev D (Setting Out as Built), received 18.11.19;
- Drawing no. MCA-MUK1801-04 Rev D (Drainage Layout as Built), received 07.11.19;
- Drawing no. MCA-MUK1801-05 Rev D (Cross Section and Track Construction as Built), received 18.11.19;
- Drawing no. MCA-MUK1801-15 Rev D (Setting Layout as Built), received 18.11.19;
- Drawing no. MCA-MUK1801-16 Rev D (Location Plan as Built), received 18.11.19;
- Drawing no. MCA-MUK1801-18 Rev D (Fence Layout as Built), received 18.11.19;
- Drawing title. Crowd barrier with half mesh, received 07.11.19;
- Drawing no.DAUNT09-OA (Proposed Sportsfield - Section Detail), approved under application K/42974;
- Drawing no.DAUNT09-OB (Proposed Sportsfield - Section Detail), approved under application K/42974.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. Within three months of the planning permission hereby granted a colour sample panel of the paint to be applied to the perimeter fence shall be provided on site, inspected and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fence shall thereafter be painted with the approved colour within one month of the date of the approval or in accordance with a timeframe to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: The matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

3. All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the date of this planning permission. All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

NOTE: The approved landscaping scheme involves the planting originally proposed on drawing no. 1743 2710 Issue C (Proposed Planting Plan) and

the additional planting shown on Drawing ref. Figure 4 (Revised landscape strategy with additional detailed planting proposals) listed above in condition 1.

4. Within three months of the planning permission hereby granted a landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for new trees and shrubs approved as part of the landscape scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: The matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, to ensure the proper management of the landscaped areas in the interests of visual amenity.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification), no gates, fences, walls or other means of enclosure, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be erected or placed anywhere on the site.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity.

6. The regarding of the site shall only be carried out in accordance with the details shown on drawing DAUNT09-OA and DAUNT09-OB, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenity of this edge of the village site.

7. The material, colour and treatment of the athletics track hereby permitted shall not be altered or replaced until full details or any proposed works have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In order to agree a suitable replacement track treatment and colour when the track reaches the end of its existing life and requires replacing in the interest of landscape character and visual amenity.

INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

The applicant is requested to notify the Local Planning Authority when the approved soft landscaping scheme required by condition 3 has been planted, and to discuss possible further planting with the Parish Council which was offered by the Head Master during the Eastern Area Planning Committee meeting.

9. **19/08155/FUL - Glyndene, 8 Fiddington Hill, Market Lavington, Devizes, SN10 4BU**

Public Participation

Mrs Anne Boddon, neighbour, spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Paul Atfield, neighbour, spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Tom Grech, neighbour, spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Simon Trueick, Agent, spoke in support of the application.

Ms Claudia House, Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Cllr Ian Myhill of Market Lavington Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

Morgan Jones, Senior Planning Officer, presented a report which recommended that planning permission be granted with conditions for the construction of one detached house with associated siteworks, with access from The Paddock.

Key issues were stated to include the principle of development; layout, design and impact on residential amenity; impact on highway & pedestrian safety; impact on ecology and surface water and drainage.

The proposal was for a detached dwelling with a new access to the site to be created from The Paddock. Plans of the proposal were shown to the meeting. It was noted that there was extant planning permission to construct a dwelling nearby the site. The site itself had a long planning history. The current application was for just one dwelling. Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) provided support in principle for schemes within the built-up area of a village, which this site was.

Plans and aerial photos were shown to the meeting. The site sat between number 12 The Paddock and number 12 Ridgeway Close. The materials proposed in the plans tied in with existing properties. A photo was shown of where the new access to the site from The Paddock would be. Loss of parking spaces as a result of the scheme was a key local concern. The Highway Authority stated that the proposal met relevant standards and that it would not have significant impact on the highway network.

The site had previously been overgrown although it had recently been cleared by the applicant. Impact on neighbour amenity was an important consideration for this application. There would be loss of light to the dwelling next door, but this was not considered an unacceptable impact.

The principle of development was supported at the site and when all factors had been considered the officers recommendation was to approve with conditions.

Members of the committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Details were sought on the loss of light at number 12 The Paddock. The officer stated that this was a material consideration. There was a clear impact on the ground floor windows, however those rooms did have other windows and there was already a boundary fence that would reduce light levels.

Although there was an impact, from a planning perspective it was not considered enough to refuse planning permission.

In response to a question regarding how close the proposed dwelling was from the neighbouring property at number 12 The Paddock, it was stated that it would be about a metre from the boundary fence.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views, as detailed above.

The unitary division member, Cllr Richard Gamble, spoke in objection to the application. Cllr Gamble stated that although he had been there it was quite difficult to view the site. There had been an earlier application for three houses, which he had called in as he felt it was so unsuitable for the site. That application had been withdrawn and then another application put in for a single dwelling. This was then revised to the current application. Although it was felt this proposal was better than previous ones he felt that there were still issues with it. In the Wiltshire Core Strategy, Core Policy 57 was in place to ensure high quality design and place making. However, he did not feel that the building was integrated into its setting. Visual amenity on The Paddock due to the new access road was also affected. The Highways Officer recommended approval. However, it was felt that there may be problems with access.

In response to public statements the officer stated that most of the points raised had been covered in the report. The extant planning permission for a two-storey extension at number 12 Ridgeway Close was mentioned in the report so had been considered. Number 14 Ridgeway Close was not part of the application site. The Highway Authority had looked at the application and provided support for the proposal.

Cllr Mark Connolly proposed a motion to follow the officer recommendation and grant planning permission with conditions. There was no seconder for this proposal.

Therefore, Cllr Richard Gamble proposed a motion to refuse the application, this was seconded by Cllr Paul Oatway QPM.

Cllr Oatway QPM, stated that vehicles may have difficulty accessing the site and in particular expressed concern about access for emergency vehicles. For clarification the officer explained that the access was 4m wide. Usually an estate road built to an adoptable standard was 5.5m wide (this allows two cars to pass). Therefore, it was quite wide for a single lane track.

Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling had visited the site and asked neighbours about parking. He did not think that taking away parking by putting in a new access road was reasonable. It would have an impact on parking in the street and a visual impact. Cllr Blair-Pilling was also concerned about the loss of light to number 12 The Paddock. The resident of number 12 The Paddock had stated during public speaking that one of the ground floor rooms whose light would be affected by the proposal did not have another window so would be severely affected by loss

of light. This felt wrong. It seemed the proposal was contrary to policies related to place shaping and neighbour amenity.

Others stated that whilst they felt this site could have a dwelling built on it, it was not felt that this proposal was right. There were issues of scale and amenity impact on the neighbours. Therefore, they did not support the application.

Cllr Connolly stated that the principle of development was met as the site was within the confines of the village. On planning balance this was probably the best proposal for the site. It was not clear how it could be improved to have less impact on the neighbours. The application could not be turned down for highways reasons as the Highways Officer had supported the application.

Prior to voting on the proposed motion, the reasons for refusal needed to be specified. After debate and discussion these were determined to be: the building layout, form and effect on the streetscape; the impact on neighbour amenity due to overdevelopment, overshadowing, overbearing and loss of light.

At the conclusion of the debate it was;

Resolved:

To refuse planning permission, against officer recommendation for the following reasons.

The proposed development, due to the position and layout of the proposed plot and associated new access onto The Paddock, along with the siting, scale and design of the proposed dwelling, would not respond positively to the character of the established built environment and would fail to integrate effectively into its setting. As a result, the development would have a harmful impact on the streetscape and the character and appearance of the area. As such, the application conflicts with Core Policy 57 'Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping' of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, in particular criterion iii.

The proposed development, due to the siting of the dwelling within close proximity to neighbouring dwellings and its overall mass and form, would have an unacceptable harmful impact on the amenities of the residents of the neighbouring dwellings as a result of overshadowing, a loss of light and an overbearing impact. The proposed development is therefore not considered to be compatible with the adjoining residential dwellings due to the harmful impact on the amenities of their occupants, in particular no.12 The Paddock. As such, the application conflicts with Core Policy 57 'Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping' of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, in particular criterion vii.

10. **19/10636/FUL - 116 High Street, Marlborough, Wiltshire, SN18 1LZ**

Public Participation

Mr Guy Loosmore, spoke in objection to the application

Mrs Marion Hannaford-Dobson, spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Aaron Henecke, Agent, spoke in support of the application.

Cllr Mark Cooper, Deputy Mayor, Marlborough Town Council spoke in objection to the application.

Lucy Rutter, Planning Officer, presented a report which recommended that planning permission be granted with conditions for the change of use of basement and ground floors from members' club (Sui Generis) to dental clinic and surgery (Use Class D1) and associated internal alterations.

The officer explained that the application had been called in by Cllr Nick Fogg MBE, due to perceived concerns that it contradicted Wiltshire's Core Strategy page 122, para 5.78 which supported Marlborough's town centre to continue to function as a prominent retail centre for east Wiltshire.

Key details were stated to include whether the use was acceptable in principle; whether the proposal would have a negative impact on parking and highway safety and impact on neighbour amenity.

It was explained that the application was for the change of use only. Any internal alterations were to be considered separately under the associated listed building application, which was being held in abeyance.

Photos of the site were shown to the meeting. The site and its surroundings lay within the North Wessex Downs AONB and the Marlborough Conservation Area. The property was formerly a member's club and was currently vacant. The application sought planning permission for the proposed change of use of the existing members' club (sui generis) to a dental clinic and surgery (use class D1 – non-residential institution).

Under the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) the proposal was considered to be acceptable in principle. It was in a sustainable location and would contribute to the vitality and viability of the area and the economy. There were a number of existing restaurants, pubs, bars and cafes in the town centre and consequently the loss of this one establishment was not considered likely to have a harmful impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre.

The officer explained that saved policy ED18 of the Kennet Local Plan offered protection specifically for the Prime Shopping Areas, but that this policy was out of date (written pre-NPPF for a time expired local plan). Although a saved policy under the WCS, the weight to be attached to it should be on the basis of its conformity with NPPF. Policy within the NPPF was stated to be a material consideration when assessing development proposals under saved policy ED18. It had been established under previous appeal decisions (Costa Coffee, High Street, Marlborough) that little weight should be given to this policy in that it did not conform with NPPF policy e.g. it was considered to be inflexible and negatively worded vs. the NPPF's flexible and positive approach to changes of use in high streets. It was thought that the proposed dental clinic would

contribute to the vitality and viability of the town centre, which demonstrated compliance with ED18.

Most of the objections received were in relation to the loss of the business, however it was confirmed that the local planning authority did not have control over ownership of the property. The applicant had stated that the first floor of the building would retain the sui generis members' club use.

The principle of development was considered to be acceptable and the application conformed with relevant development plan policies. As such it was recommended for approval.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views, as detailed above.

The unitary division member, Cllr Nick Fogg MBE, spoke in objection to the application. Cllr Fogg MBE had called the application in as it was a hugely valuable community facility. Its loss would be a blow to the vibrancy of the high street. He thought it was a viable business and stressed the value of the asset. The site had been a hostelry since the 15th century. It had been a conservative club for many, many years. The facility could be used for weddings, wakes and other large occasions and was not replicated elsewhere in Marlborough, other than at the Town Hall. It was used by a large number of organisations. The upper floor had two residential units. The applicant's offer to maintain the first floor as a social club had issues in his opinion. He felt that you could not separate consents in that way; also you would be unable to access the upper floors when the dental clinic was closed. The two nearest neighbours were said to be opposed to the application. Cllr Fogg, MBE thought it was odd that a retained policy could be declared redundant. He urged the committee to reject the application.

Cllr Mark Connolly proposed a motion to grant planning permission with conditions as per the officer recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr James Sheppard.

Cllr Stewart Dobson stated that the members club had recently been opened to the public. The High Street was the heart of Marlborough and was still vibrant and viable. The site was one of two large venues in the town. The applicant already had approval for a dental clinic at 42 High Street and there were three other dentists in the town so there was no need for another dental clinic. It was suggested that footfall for a dental clinic would not be as high as in its current use. He felt policy ED18, which stated there should only be A1 uses permitted within the Primary Shopping Centre, should be complied with. He was unaware of problems with anti-social behaviour or littering associated with the current use. Therefore, he felt there was no justification for the change of use and stated that he would not be supporting the application.

Cllr Mark Connolly stated that although dental practices were not typically found in high street locations, these needed to adapt and change. Marlborough was lucky to have a vibrant high street. He did not feel you could refuse the

application due to the number of other dental clinics in the town. He was not against the D1 use in principle. He felt that you could not consider the possible use of the first floor as a member's club as it was not part of the application. He felt that if the business was well used and viable it would not have closed.

Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling stated that his first inclination was to support the proposal. At the Council level, policy was set to try to ensure consistency. However, the Council was increasingly asking local communities to take the lead. It was extremely clear from the speakers that the community was against the proposal. Therefore, he would not support the application.

At the conclusion of the debate, the proposed motion to grant planning permission with conditions was voted on. The motion did not pass.

Cllr Stewart Dobson proposed a motion to refuse planning permission, which was seconded by Cllr Nick Fogg, MBE.

Technical advice was received from the planning officers. They advised that we could not stop people applying for the change of use for different floors. It was also stated that at a previous appeal the planning inspector had said that retained policy ED18 was out of date and was negatively worded, unlike the NPPF which had a more positive emphasis.

After debate the reasons for refusal were stated as follows. The application was contrary to policy ED18 as it was not an A1 use. In addition, it was contrary to the spirit of NPPF paragraph 92, point C: To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needed, planning policies and decisions should - guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs; and point D - ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise, and are retained for the benefit of the community. It was also contrary to WCS core policy 14 paragraph 5.78.

At the conclusion of the debate it was;

Resolved:

To refuse planning permission, against the officer recommendation, for the following reason:

The proposed change of use would result in the loss of an important existing facility within the Primary Shopping Area of Marlborough. The proposed development is not an A1 use nor would it make a positive contribution to the vitality and viability of the town centre. As such, it would be contrary to saved policy ED18 and Core Policy 14 (paragraph 5.78) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015 and Section 7 (paragraph 85) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

At 17:15 the Chairman adjourned the meeting for a comfort break. The meeting reconvened at 17:20.

11. **19/09834/FUL - Clock House, Road off Honeystreet North of Canal, Honeystreet, SN9 5PS**

Public Participation

Mr Alex Oliver, spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Alex Whittle, spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Michael Spencer, spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Donavon Love, Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Tom Jakes, Agent, spoke in support of the application.

Cllr Robert Carpenter-Turner of Alton Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

Ruaridh O'Donoghue, Senior Planning Officer presented a report which recommended that planning permission be granted with conditions for the demolition of two dwellings and vacant commercial buildings and their replacement with six dwellings.

Key details were stated to include whether the development was acceptable in principle; whether the scheme constitutes high quality design; whether the scheme would preserve or enhance the historic environment; whether the scheme would have an acceptable landscape impact; whether the proposal would have a negative impact on highway safety; whether the site can be adequately drained and whether there would be harmful impacts on protected species or habitats.

Attention was drawn to the late observations.

Some late submissions from a third-party objector had been published with the agenda. These consisted of a visual impact assessment and a light pollution statement. The third-party objector had submitted updated versions of these documents, which superseded the versions in the agenda and these were circulated to the committee. The late objections were considered, and officers did not change their recommendation.

There had also been a late consultation response from the Wiltshire Council Ecologist who reported that they supported the application, subject to conditions. If approved, the development should be carried out in strict accordance with the mitigation and enhancement measures outlined in the ecological report. They also stated there should be no additional lighting installed. The officer explained that these conditions were already included as part of the recommendation.

Photos of the site were shown, which the officer described to the committee. There were two dwellings in a poor state of repair and other dilapidated commercial buildings. The site lay in open country side, within the North Wessex Downs AONB and there was a listed building nearby.

The proposal was stated to be the demolition of the buildings and their replacement with six dwellings. The dwellings were all to be of a similar

appearance, comprising black stained timber for the walls and natural slate tiles for the roofs. Each property would also have a stainless-steel flue. All the properties had the same ridge heights, although the site was not totally level, so the properties would not all be at the same level. There was dedicated parking for each property, dedicated bin storage and cycle storage was also provided. House types, elevations and floor plans were shown.

It was stated that there was an extant planning permission on the site for five dwellings and that this was a significant material consideration. Even with an additional dwelling, the footprint of the application was stated to be less than the footprint of the extant permission.

The more sensitive boundaries of the site had more sympathetic fencing proposed, in the form of hazel hurdles, or post and cleft chestnut pale fencing. It was judged that there would be no harm caused to heritage assets and the proposal complied with Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 58. The Highways Authority had reported that there was a safe and suitable means of access to the highway and that parking met with the adopted standards. There had been no objections to the drainage scheme. The proposal would achieve a biodiversity net gain as the landscaping scheme included more native species and the introduction of bat, bird and hedgehog boxes.

The site was currently an unused brown field site which would be brought back into use as a result of the proposal. On balance the officer recommendation was to approve planning permission with conditions

There were no technical questions.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views, as detailed above.

The unitary division member, Cllr Paul Oatway, QPM, spoke in objection to the application. It was stated that although the village was not opposed to development of the site in principle, six houses on this plot constituted overdevelopment. The design of the houses was not in keeping with the area. The Parish Council had not been consulted early in the process and 90% of the community opposed the development. The parking was also felt to be an issue. Especially in the summer, there was considered to be a lack of parking in the area. The positioning of some of the parking bays also meant that people would have to reverse out into the road, which could be quite busy - this was felt to be dangerous. Cllr Oatway QPM referred the meeting to the CPRE consultation response which he agreed with. He also felt that the proposal was contrary to WCS Core Policy 58 as the development would not enhance the setting of the nearby Grade II Listed building (Mill House) and may cause harm to it.

In response to public statements the officer stated that he had spoken to the Urban Design officer who had given advice to one of the objectors. The buildings were not back to back. There was no guidance in Wiltshire Council Policy regarding the distances required between dwellings which were not back

to back. The Urban Design officer was not in possession of all the information when they gave their advice.

The objectors and Parish Council had stated they much preferred extant scheme. However, it was noted by the officer that there had been some objections to it. The Highways Authority had stated that the proposal was safe. Unfortunately, it was common that there was a lack of engagement between developers and the local parish council. There was no absolute requirement for people to do this, although it was disappointing when engagement did not occur. With regards to the CPRE comments regarding the impact on Mill House, the conservation officer had disagreed with their assessment.

Cllr Mark Connolly proposed a motion to grant planning permission with conditions as per the officer recommendation. No one seconded the motion.

Cllr Paul Oatway QPM, then proposed a motion to refuse planning permission, against officer recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling.

Cllr Richard Gamble stated that if this application had come in when there was no extant planning permission on the site, then it would be easy to refuse as it was in open countryside. However, the extant permission complicated the situation. The extant scheme was more traditional, with cottage type houses and had the broad support of community. He felt that the current proposal did not have support due to the design of the houses, which were alien to the area and community. Therefore, he felt that the application was contrary to WCS Core Policy 51 as it did not have regard to the locally distinctive character of the settlement. He also felt it was contrary to WCS Core Policy 57 as the development did not enhance the character of the settlement and was not informed by a thorough understanding of the locality and the development site. Therefore, he would not be supporting the application.

Many of the members agreed that there were numerous peripheral reasons that the application was disappointing. However, the main issue was that the proposed design simply did not fit in and was out of character with the area. Therefore, they felt that they could not support the application.

Cllr Mark Connolly stated that the principle of development had already been established due to the extant permission. It was hard to determine if six dwellings would constitute overdevelopment. The overall footprint of those dwellings was less than that of the extant permission. Although members had concerns about the parking and highway safety, the Highways Authority had stated that it was acceptable and therefore they could not refuse on that basis. However, he felt that the design of the site was inappropriate and did not fit its setting. Therefore, he would not be supporting the application.

Members felt that the scale, layout and design of the properties were issues of concern. The impact on the area and the landscape were also considered to be an issue, along with the impact on heritage (designated and non-designated) assets, namely a listed building and the canal.

At the conclusion of the debate it was;

Resolved:

To refuse planning permission, against officer recommendation, for the following reasons:

The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, design, materials and layout, would not enhance local distinctiveness, would not respond positively to existing townscape and landscape features and would not be sympathetic to or conserve historic buildings. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015.

The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, design, materials and layout, has not taken account of the locally distinctive character of Honeystreet and its landscape setting, nor the need to protect against intrusive light pollution. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Core Policy 51 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015 and to paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 which requires great weight to be given to the conservation and enhancement of the landscape and scenic beauty of, amongst other things, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, design, materials, layout and proximity, would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the grade II listed Mill House and the nearby Kennet and Avon Canal. There are no identified public benefits that would outweigh this harm. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Core Policy 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the policies contained within the historic environment chapter of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

12. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 3.30 - 6.30 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Tara Shannon of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 718352, e-mail tara.shannon@wiltshire.gov.uk

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