

## Eastern Area Planning Committee

---

### MINUTES OF THE EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ONLINE ON 9 JULY 2020.

#### **Present:**

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

#### **Also Present:**

Cllr Stuart Wheeler.

---

#### 13. **Apologies**

There were no apologies for the meeting.

#### 14. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2020 were presented for consideration and it was;

#### **Resolved:**

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

#### 15. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 16. **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman announced that if the Committee took a short break at any point, the broadcast would continue.

Therefore, he requested that Members and Officers did not engage in discussion during that break and that they muted their microphones.

#### 17. **Public Participation**

The Chairman detailed the procedure for the meeting and the procedures for public participation which were set out at item 5 of the agenda.

#### 18. **Planning Appeals and Updates**

The Chairman requested that Andrew Guest, Major Projects and Performance Manager, introduce the Appeals Report as detailed on pages 27-30 of the agenda pack and requested that Members email any questions on the report to Andrew Guest.

Andrew Guest stated that he had nothing to add to the list of decisions detailed in the report but was happy to receive questions.

The Chairman proposed a motion that the Committee note the updates, this was seconded by Cllr Paul Oatway QPM. It was

**Resolved:**

**To note the report on completed and pending appeals.**

19. **Planning Applications**

The following planning applications were considered.

20. **20/02218/FUL - Land opposite Hungerford Road, A338, East Grafton, Marlborough, Wiltshire, SN8 3DF**

Public Participation

David Lemon (Applicant) provided a statement in support of the application.

Aaron Smith (Agent) provided a statement in support of the application.

Bill Clemence provided a statement in support of the application.

Grafton Parish Council provided a statement in support of the application.

Andrew Guest, Major Projects and Performance Manager, presented a report which recommended that planning permission be refused for the erection of 15 dwellings with access onto A338, formation of bus stop layby on A338, parking and associated landscaping with change of use of agricultural land to residential garden land.

Key details were stated to include the following.

In planning policy terms East Grafton was a small village in the countryside and the application lay beyond the Eastern edge of the village in the countryside. Wiltshire Council Core Policy 1 (CP1) and Wiltshire Council Core Policy 2 (CP2) limit development in small villages to infill, which was defined as the filling of a small gap within the village that was only large enough for not more than a few dwellings. Therefore, the proposal, being for 15 dwellings and not being within the village did not meet this definition. Consequently, it was classed as unsustainable development and was contrary to CP1 and CP2.

In addition, the NPPF stated that permission should be refused for major developments (which this would be classed as) in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) other than in exceptional circumstances and where it

can be demonstrated that the development was in the public interest, which was not the case for this proposal, as detailed in the report.

There were also issues with the proposal having a detrimental impact on views in the area and the proposal not meeting the exception policy for affordable housing in rural areas (CP44). Whilst it was accepted that the Local Authority could not now demonstrate a five year housing supply, there was only a modest shortfall and recent appeal decisions (contained in the agenda pack) concluded that the overall strategy of the Wiltshire Core Strategy remained desirable and effective.

There were no technical questions for the officer.

In accordance with the procedure for virtual meetings public statements were then read out by the Democratic Services Officers, as detailed above, with any further statements included in Agenda Supplement 1 along with the committee presentation.

The unitary division member, Cllr Stuart Wheeler, Burbage and The Bedwyns, spoke in support of the application. Cllr Wheeler's main points concerned: the shortfall on the five year housing supply meaning that certain applications should be looked upon favourably; that the AONB had not been consulted and were in support of the application; that the definition of infill was restrictive and open to interpretation; the Wiltshire Council Residential Development Project had made an offer on the six affordable homes and the proposal was supported by the community and the boundaries of the village were up for debate.

In response to public statements the officer directed the Committee again to the appeal decisions concerning the five year housing supply. It was explained that there was no settlement boundary for East Grafton as it was a small village and as such was considered as being in the countryside, where only infill development was permitted. The Wiltshire Council Residential Development Project team had confirmed that the offer made was not intended to support the planning process and the offer would only become relevant if the approval was granted, as had been stated in the offer.

Prior to the debate Cllr Mark Connolly proposed a motion to refuse the application as per the officer recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling.

A debate followed where issues raised included that this was first class agricultural land which the Country was losing rapidly. The proposal was the wrong scheme for the site and the applicant could consider looking at other routes such as the Rural Exception Site Scheme or a Neighbourhood Plan could be developed by the Parish and community. The role of the Committee was to determine if this application fitted within planning policy. Planning inspectors had stated that the core strategy still carried weight despite the five year land supply not quite being met.

At the conclusion of the debate it was;

**Resolved:**

That planning permission be refused, for the following reasons -

1. **Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy sets out the 'Settlement Strategy' for the County, and identifies five tiers of settlement - Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres, Large Villages and Small Villages. Within the Settlement Strategy East Grafton is identified as a Small Village. The Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages have defined boundaries, or limits of development. Beyond the limits - and including the Small Villages - is countryside.**

**Core Policy 2 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy sets out the 'Delivery Strategy'. It identifies the scale of growth appropriate within each settlement tier. The policy states that within the limits of development of those settlements with defined limits there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and at Small Villages in the countryside development will be limited to 'infill' within the existing built area (defined as "the filling of a small gap within the village that is only large enough for not more than a few dwellings, generally only one dwelling"); but outside these parameters, other in circumstances as permitted by other policies of the Plan, development will not be permitted, and that the limits of development may only be altered through identification of sites for development through subsequent Site Allocations Development Plan Documents and neighbourhood plans. The application site is not identified for development in a Development Plan Document or Neighbourhood Plan.**

**Core Policy 18 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy sets out the 'Spatial Strategy' for the Pewsey Community Area in which East Grafton lies. It confirms that over the plan period approximately 600 new homes will be provided in the Area consisting of a range of sites in accordance with Core Policies 1 and 2. The latest housing figures, published in the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan Topic Paper 3 Addendum (July 2018) confirms that the indicative requirement for the Wiltshire Core Strategy plan period (2006-2026) in the Pewsey Community Area has been met, i.e. the current residual requirement for the Pewsey Community Area is 0 dwellings due to completions and extant permissions. In identifying its supply of specific deliverable housing sites Wiltshire Council uses suitably defined sub-county areas as referred to in the Wiltshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Wiltshire Core Strategy, titled 'Housing Market Areas'. The Pewsey Community Area lies within the East Wiltshire Housing Market Area. The Topic Paper also shows that there is at least an 8 year housing land supply in the East Wiltshire Housing Market Area at this time.**

**This said – and notwithstanding the above figures – in terms of paragraphs 11 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, a recent appeal decision elsewhere in the wider Wiltshire Council area has confirmed that there is, in fact, a housing shortfall, this in the context of supply being calculated county-wide now that the Wiltshire Core Strategy is more than 5 years old and in view of some sites not being deemed as imminently deliverable. The confirmed supply is in the range of 4.42 to 4.62 years. But, regardless of this – and as determined by the appeal inspector – there remains substantial benefit in maintaining a plan-led system, and accordingly the overall strategy of the Core Strategy to direct development to the most sustainable settlements remains both desirable and preferable in meeting the objectives of the Framework. The Inspector confirmed, *“Even at the lower end of the range ..... there is a relatively modest shortfall in housing land in the Wiltshire Council area. The local housing need derived from the standard method is very similar to the housing requirement contained in the CS for the relevant five-year period and so there is no reason to think that the strategy will not continue to be effective, particularly in light of recent progress in adopting the Housing Site Allocations Plan”*.**

**Accordingly, very significant weight is still given to the Wiltshire Core Strategy policies; in terms of paragraph 59, the Core Strategy is still “boosting significantly the supply of housing” in the Area in any event. It follows that further other, or ‘windfall’, sites, or sites delivered outside of any housing site allocations DPD or neighbourhood plan, continue to be not required at this time and will continue to be deemed unsustainable in the context of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.**

**This proposal itself is to erect 15 houses, etc. on land which is in the countryside and which does not comply with defined criteria for ‘infill’ development in Small Villages. Under Core Policies 1, 2 and 18, this does not accord with the Settlement and Delivery Strategies as a matter of principle. The Strategies are designed to ensure new development satisfies the fundamental principles of sustainability and so it follows that where a proposal such as this does not accord with them then it is unsustainable in this defining and overarching context. The site is not identified for development in a Site Allocations Development Plan Document, nor in a Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, there are no material considerations or exceptional circumstances, including set out in other policies of the Plan (including Core Policy 44), which override the core policy’s positions. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Core Policies 1, 2 and 18 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and paragraphs 10-12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

- 2. The application site lies within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In the context of paragraph 172 of the**

**National Planning Policy Framework the proposal – for 15 dwellings on a c.0.9 ha site – comprises ‘major’ development. As there are no exceptional circumstances, and as the development is not required in the public interest, the presumption that planning permission should be refused for major development, as set out in the NPPF, applies. For reasons set out in reason for refusal no. 1, there is no ‘need’ for the proposed development; there is scope for residential development to be provided outside the designated area or in some other way; and the proposal would, in any event, have a detrimental effect on the environment and landscape.**

**Regarding landscape impact, the proposal would be detrimental to the Landscape Character Area (LCA) in which it is located, and would have harmful visual effects, albeit at a local level. In terms of the LCA, it is identified as having an essentially rural, agricultural character within which “small-scale, sensitively-designed development, associated with built form, could be successfully accommodated without adverse impacts”. The proposal – being ‘major’-scale (in terms of size and quantum of development); *and* being not sensitively-designed (in terms of form / layout of buildings, and resulting limited opportunities for landscaping/mitigation); *and* being not associated with existing built form (by encroaching on to open land and coalescing with other scattered development outside of the existing village) – would not be sympathetic to the specific LCA, and more generally would not protect, conserve or enhance the landscape character of the wider area. In terms of the visual effects, the local views towards the site are identified in isolation to be adverse. Again, by reason of the size/quantum of development and the insensitivities of the design (notably, with inadequate opportunities for meaningful mitigation), these impacts are considered to be unacceptable, the development failing to protect, conserve or enhance the visual amenities of the landscape hereabouts. This is contrary to Policies 51 and 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and paragraphs 170 & 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

- 3. The application fails to provide any mechanism to ensure that the provision of essential infrastructure, services and amenities made necessary by the development can be delivered. The essential infrastructure, services and amenities include affordable housing, open space/recreation areas, highways infrastructure, and waste/refuse collection facilities (and/or contributions towards such infrastructure, services and amenities). This is contrary to Core Policy 3 ('Infrastructure requirements') and, more specifically, Core Policy 43 ('Providing affordable homes') and Core Policy 52 ('Green Infrastructure') of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and 'saved' Policies HC34 and HC37 of the Kennet Local Plan; and paragraphs 56-57 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

4. The proposed development, by reason of the number of market houses proposed and the size of the scheme, fundamentally undermines the Council's approach to rural exception sites set out in Core Policy 44, and if approved, would set an undesirable precedent that could hinder the delivery of such affordable housing across the county.
5. **INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT: Notwithstanding reasons for refusal 1, 2 and 4, reason for refusal no. 3 may be overcome in the event of the applicant completing an appropriate planning obligation. The reason for refusal is necessary in the event that there is an appeal and such an obligation is not completed or not satisfactorily completed.**

21. **20/01631/FUL - Honey Street Mill, 2 A Honeystreet, Pewsey, Wiltshire, SN9 5PS**

Public Participation

Alex Whittle provided a statement in objection to the application

Robert Carpenter Turner provided a statement in objection to the application.

Nicola Sidney provided a statement in objection to the application.

Richard Cosker (Agent for the applicant) provided a statement in support of the application.

John Wyles (Applicant) provided a statement in support of the application.

Camilla and Piers Hampton provided a statement in support of the application.

Alton Parish Council provided a statement in objection to the application.

Jonathan James, Senior Planning Officer presented a report which recommended that planning permission be granted with conditions for the change of use of a former factory building to D1 exhibition hall (for a Crop Circle Exhibition) - Resubmission of 19/10296/FUL.

Attention was drawn to the late observations. It was stated that objections were maintained on the proposal in relation to comments on the inaccuracy of visitor numbers; ticket sales not being an accurate representation of visitor numbers; inaccuracies on details submitted; lack of proper accounts; objections to the exhibition but not the café; the subject of the exhibition; no disabled access; references to insufficient parking and highways safety impacts, which contained no new comments other than those contained in communications already received and addressed.

Late letters of support had also been received which included support for the scheme; benefits for the area; the proposal was a valuable education resource; the scheme brought tourism to the area; the scheme supported local businesses.

The conversion to the exhibition centre had already taken place with minimal alterations to the building. Key details were stated to include the provision of parking and highways safety. The building currently had planning permission for B1 and B8 uses. Taken in isolation, if applying the parking standard for those

uses equated to a maximum requirement for 4 parking spaces. If the D1 use was granted this would also give a maximum requirement for 4 parking spaces. The wider site, including the café, shop and warehouse had 34 spaces in total. Plans and photographs of the site were shown.

Members of the committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Clarification was sought on the whether the maximum requirement for parking was the same in the current B1/B8 use and the proposed D1 use. It was confirmed that the floor area of the building associated with the conversion had the same requirement of 4 parking spaces, whether in B1/B8 use or D1 use. It was acknowledged in the report that there was a shortfall of parking across the wider site, but the situation would not be made worse by this proposal.

In accordance with the procedure for virtual meetings public statements were then read out by the Democratic Services Officers, as detailed above, with any further statements included in Agenda Supplement 1 along with the committee presentation.

The unitary division member, Cllr Paul Oatway, spoke in objection to the application. The main concerns raised were related to parking issues at the site. It was stated that 80 letters regarding the proposal had been received.

In response to public statements the officer stated that the Council had acknowledged the shortfall of parking across the site, it had formed part of the overall assessment and had not been ignored when making the recommendation on the application. The proposal to convert the warehouse from B1/B8 use to D1 use would not make the scenario worse. They had received 84 letters on the application, however it should be noted that 47 of the letters had been generated by 2 objectors and that the split between objections received and support received was almost equal.

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

A debate followed where the following issues were discussed. The proposal would not cause detriment to the parking situation as it had the same requirement as the current use for 4 parking spaces. Following planning policy, no grounds could be seen to refuse the application. Some Cllrs when visiting the site had not encountered parking problems and felt that officers had used the correct criteria when assessing parking. It was suggested that an informative should be added that coaches should drop off their passengers and park elsewhere, not taking up parking spaces on the site.

Cllr Stewart Dobson proposed an amendment to the motion, that an informative should be added prohibiting the parking of coaches on the site, the final wording of this informative was to be delegated to officers. This was seconded by Cllr Mark Connolly. It was



Resolved:

To amend the motion to grant planning permission with conditions as per the officer recommendation, with the addition of an informative to prohibit the parking of coaches on the site. The final wording of which was to be delegated to officers.

Other issues raised included the fact that the car parking bays were not clearly marked, that the photographs of the site and the agreed shortfall over the whole site proved that there was not enough parking. Others stated that if the parking was full when a visitor arrived they would go on to another location. There was no proof that the photos shown of people parking on the road were visitors to the site.

At the conclusion of the debate it was;

Resolved:

**To grant planning permission with the following conditions as per the officer recommendation, with the addition of an informative to prohibit coaches parking at the site. The final wording of the informative would be delegated to officers.**

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

**Application Form; Agents email (dated 13/05/2020); Agents email (dated 24/04/2020) with breakdown of floor areas; Location Plan, Ground and First Floor Plans Dwg No. 02; Existing Car Parking Plan, Dwg No. BDS-05/20; Proposed Car Parking Plan, Dwg No. BDS-05/20; Crop Circle Centre and Exhibition (back ground and break down of visitor numbers, rcvd 10/06/2020)**

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

- 2. There shall be no customers/members of the public within the exhibition hall hereby approved outside the hours of 11:00 to 17.30 from Monday to Sunday.**

**REASON: To ensure the creation/retention of an environment free from intrusive levels of noise and activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.**

- 3. Within one month of the date of this decision, the parking scheme as approved under the approved plan, Proposed Car Parking Plan, Dwg No. BDS-05/20, under condition 1 above, shall have been laid out for the use of parking in accordance with this detail. This area shall be maintained and remain available for this use at all times thereafter.**

**REASON: To ensure that adequate provision is made for parking within the site in the interests of highway safety.**

**4. INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:**

**Notwithstanding the details hereby permitted this planning consent provides for an exhibition hall only as shown on the approved plans and outlined in red. This does not grant consent for the retail unit as also shown on the submitted details.**

**5. INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:**

**The applicant is advised to discourage coaches from parking at the Honey Street Mill site itself, and to instead request that operators safely 'drop-off' and 'pick-up' passengers at the roadside entrance only.**

**22. Rights of Way Items**

The following Rights of Way items were considered.

**23. Highways Act 1980 - The Wiltshire Council Burbage 6 (Part) Extinguishment Order 2020**

Public Participation

Adrian Noviss, (Agent for the applicant) provided a statement in support of the application.

Craig Harlow, Definitive Map Officer presented a report which recommended that "The Wiltshire Council Burbage 6 (part) Extinguishment Order 2020" should be determined by SoSEFRA with Wiltshire Council recommending that the Order be confirmed.

Key details were stated to include the following: Wiltshire Council received an application dated 19 July 2019, made under Section 118 of the Highways Act 1980, to extinguish part of the width of footpath Burbage 6, on the grounds that it was not needed for public use. The section to be extinguished measured 3.3 metres wide by 21 metres long. At that point the path was recorded as being 8 metres wide. The path would retain a width of 4.7 metres if the Order was confirmed. The legal test under section 118 was to consider whether the path was needed. Consultations had been carried out and two objections had been received. It was determined that the section of footpath to be extinguished was not needed for public use as the path would still be wide enough (4.7 metres) for the public to use. Once made the Order received one objection. This was considered and was addressed in the officer's report. The Officer was proposing that the Order be confirmed as that section of the path was not needed for public use and any use was very limited. The Order would also not have a negative effect on the public using the footpath.

In accordance with the procedure for virtual meetings public statements were then read out by the Democratic Services Officers, as detailed above, with any

further statements included in Agenda Supplement 1 along with the committee presentation.

Cllr Mark Connolly proposed a motion that “The Wiltshire Council Burbage 6 (part) Extinguishment Order 2020” should be determined by SoSEFRA with Wiltshire Council recommending that the Order be confirmed, as per the officer recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Paul Oatway, QPM.

A debate followed where the following points were made. The case seemed clear cut and the width of the path that would remain, which was 4.7 metres wide, was wide enough to allow the public to continue to use the path without any issues.

At the conclusion of the debate it was;

**Resolved:**

**That “The Wiltshire Council Burbage 6 (part) Extinguishment Order 2020” should be determined by SoSEFRA with Wiltshire Council recommending that the Order be confirmed.**

24. **Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 s.53 ("the 1981 Act") - The Wiltshire Council Grafton 29 (Part), 29A, 30 and 31, Burbage 1 (Part) and Collingbourne Kingston 34 Definitive Map Modification Order 2019**

Public Participation

Lewis Ballin provided a statement in objection to the application.

Jack Edwards (Agent for Southgrove Farm) provided a statement in objection to the application.

Amy Richards provided a statement in objection to the application.

Rosie Pack provided a statement in support of the application.

Annabelle Roycroft provided a statement in support of the application.

Bill Riley (Applicant) provided a statement in support of the application.

Nigel Baybrook of Collingbourne Kingston Parish Council provided a statement regarding the application.

Sally Madgwick, Definitive Map and Highways Records Manager presented a report which recommended that The Wiltshire Council Grafton 29 (part), 29A, 30 and 31, Burbage 1 (part) and Collingbourne Kingston 34 Definitive Map Modification Order 2019 was submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (SoSEFRA) with the recommendation that the Order is confirmed as made.

Key details were stated to include the following: The Council had a statutory duty under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to keep the definitive map and statement under continual review and to make legal orders to correct it where errors were found. A basic premise in regard to highways was ‘*once a highway, always a highway*’. Evidence had been found that showed that a number of rights of way linking West Grafton with Collingbourne Kingston should be recorded as restricted byways. They were currently recorded as a

mixture of footpaths and bridleways. A restricted byway was a public right of way for walkers, horse riders, cyclists and carriage drivers. There would be no right to use a mechanically powered vehicle on a restricted byway and it would be an offence to do so.

It had been found that the majority of the route was awarded to the public as a 40 foot wide Public Carriage Road in an Inclosure Award in 1792 and this was highly weighted evidence. This was the last legal event effecting the route. Maps, plans and documents had also been found which were consistent with the route being a public road. Evidence had also been discovered labelling part of the route as a road as far back as AD 961.

The order had received 2 representations of support and 2 objections. Due to the objections being received the Order would need to be sent to SoSEFRA for determination. The Council and SoSEFRA could only take into account objections that were relevant to the evidence, for example evidence of legal extinguishment of the public rights on the route. Landowners concerns, and objections related to management concerns which were not relevant to the determination of the Order could not be considered.

Representations to the Committee showed some misunderstanding, this process was about correctly recording the route. Currently one of the landowners permitted walkers to walk on a permissive route which it was stated would be withdrawn if the Order was confirmed. Permissive routes were between the landowner and the users of the route and not a matter for Wiltshire Council under section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and therefore were not relevant to the Committee's decision.

Members of the committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. It was stated that in 1952 the route had been recorded as a footpath, but that did not extinguish the previous rights. If the Order was confirmed, there was a wholly separate legal process whereby the landowner could change the route to a footpath or bridleway. It was confirmed that in 2006 an Act of Parliament had extinguished the public right to use the way with a mechanically propelled vehicle. It was clarified that in 2026 all unrecorded historic rights on footpaths and bridleways could be extinguished which was why it would be risky to delay the determination. However, regulations giving further clarification were awaited. The awarded width of the route was 40 feet.

In accordance with the procedure for virtual meetings public statements were then read out by the Democratic Services Officers, as detailed above, with any further statements included in Agenda Supplement 1 along with the committee presentation.

In response to public statements the officer stated that this was an evidence based procedure and if the Committee came to a decision contrary to officer recommendation they would need to state their reasons for doing so.

Cllr Mark Connolly proposed a motion that the Wiltshire Council Grafton 29 (part), 29A, 30 and 31, Burbage 1 (part) and Collingbourne Kingston 34

Definitive Map Modification Order 2019 be submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (SoSEFRA) with the recommendation that the Order was confirmed as made, as per the officer recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Ian Blair-Pilling.

A debate followed where issues were raised. Cllr Stewart Dobson felt that there may need to be compromise on this occasion and that possibly this route was more suited to being a bridleway rather than a restricted byway. There may be issues with people using quad bikes or motor bikes on the restricted byway. It would also be detrimental if the landowner removed the permissive route for walkers. Other Councillors stated that the Committee needed to follow the laws applicable on this occasion and that there was no legal reason not to confirm the Order. This would also provide a safe route for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

At the conclusion of the debate it was;

**Resolved:**

**That the Wiltshire Council Grafton 29 (part), 29A, 30 and 31, Burbage 1 (part) and Collingbourne Kingston 34 Definitive Map Modification Order 2019 be submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (SoSEFRA) with the recommendation that the Order was confirmed as made.**

25. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 2.00 - 4.40 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](mailto:tara.shannon@wiltshire.gov.uk)

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

This page is intentionally left blank